

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



RESERVE  
A281.9

N44

1964

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

OCT 27 1965

C & R-PREP.

3  
making

RAD

work in

New England

Regional RAD Conference

April 1964, Boston

Technical Papers assembled

by: Soil Conservation Service

Amherst, Massachusetts

AD-33 Bookplate  
(1-63)

**NATIONAL**

**A  
G  
R  
I  
C  
U  
L  
T  
U  
R  
A  
L**



**LIBRARY**

**89485**

**RESERVE  
A281.9  
N44**



2  
NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL RAD CONFERENCE, 2a

Statler Hilton Hotel

April 28-29, 1964, 2b 2a 2b Boston, Massachusetts

FIRST DAY - April 28

8:00 a.m. Registration

9:00 Chairman's Welcome and Introduction: R. P. Davison, Director, Vermont Extension Service, University of Vermont - General Conference Chairman

9:15 Address - Keynote and Orientation  
Honorable John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture

10:00 Recess

10:30 Address - Making RAD Work in Northern New England: Dr. Frederic Sargent, Head, Department of Agriculture Economics, University of Vermont

11:00 Address - Making RAD Work in Southern New England: Dr. John Blackmore, Head, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Massachusetts

11:30 Discussion

12:00 Lunch

1:15 p.m. Raymond Freeman, State Director, Farmers Home Administration, Concord, New Hampshire - Chairman

Case Studies of Rural Areas Development Activities in Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont

1. Washington County, Maine
2. Southern Berkshire County, Massachusetts
3. Northeast Kingdom, Vermont

3:30 Recess

4:00 Discussion - Problems and Solutions: John Rego, Associate Director of Extension Service, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island - Leader

5:00 Recess

6:00 Social Hour



FIRST DAY - April 28 (continued)

7:00 Dinner - Paul Tedrow, State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, Storrs, Connecticut - Chairman

Discussion of Economic Opportunity Act - 1964

Film - Washington County, Maine

Address - William Patric, President's Temporary Committee on Poverty, Washington, D. C.

SECOND DAY - April 29

Benjamin Isgur, State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, Amherst, Massachusetts - General Chairman

8:30 a.m. Address - Dr. Nyle C. Brady, Director of Science and Education, USDA

9:00 Discussion

9:15 Discussion Groups--to be arranged and programmed in advance by Group Chairmen:

Group I -- Effective Organizational Structures for RAD  
(Committees and alternative types of organization)  
Lemuel Peet, Vermont State Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, Burlington--Chairman

Group II -- Relationships with State and Local Organizations  
George Witham, County Agent Leader, Connecticut Extension Service, University of Connecticut, Storrs--Chairman

Group III -- Problems and Solutions in Getting Effective TAP Contributions to (a) Program Formulation, and (b) Project Planning  
Benjamin Isgur--Chairman

Group IV -- What Are the Goals of RAD and Are They Adequate?  
Nelson LeRay, Jr., Department of Rural Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca--Chairman

Group V -- Proper Development of OEDPs and Coordination with Other Planning and Development Programs, Including Functions of Respective Agencies  
James Wood, Regional RAD Coordinator, New England Office of RAD, Montpelier, Vermont--Chairman



SECOND DAY - April 29 (continued)

Group VI -- Need for Feasibility Studies and Research in  
Project Implementation and Who Can Provide Them

Harry Keener, Dean, College of Agriculture, University  
of New Hampshire, Durham--Chairman

Group VII -- Effective Administrative Arrangements for Doing  
the RAD Job and Needs for Additional Resources

Leslie Kimball, State Executive Director, Massachusetts  
State ASCS Office, Amherst--Chairman

12:00 Noon Recess

1:00 p.m. R. P. Davison--Chairman

Discussion of Other Agency Programs and Their Contributions  
to RAD

Joseph Courtney, Coordinator of ARA Programs, Commission  
of Administration and Finance, Boston--Chairman  
(During this period, group chairmen and secretaries will  
prepare reports)

1:45 Presentation of Group Reports and Discussions by Group Chairmen

3:15 Summary and a Look-Ahead

Lloyd H. Davis, Administrator, Federal Extension Service,  
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington

3:45 Adjournment





Present at  
NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL RAD CONFERENCE  
Boston, Massachusetts  
April 28 and 29, 1964

G. R. Allison, U.S. Forest Service  
Thomas L. Ayers, ASCS, Washington  
John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary, USDA, Washington  
Alan R. Bird, ERS, Washington  
Dr. John Blackmore, University of Massachusetts  
George E. Bond, Ext., Rhode Island  
Lyndon H. Bond, Fisheries, Maine  
Dr. Nyle C. Brady, Science and Education, USDA, Washington  
Charles S. Brown, SCS, New Hampshire  
Warren I. Brown, ASCS, Maine  
Clifford H. Carlson, ASCS, Massachusetts  
Lawrence A. Chatto, ASCS, Maine  
George Chick, Department of Agriculture, Maine  
William H. Coates, SCS, Massachusetts  
M. Eldon Colby, FCIC, Washington  
Charles O. Crawford, Ext., Connecticut  
Joseph Courtney, Boston University, Massachusetts  
Donald Davis, ASCS, New Hampshire  
Lloyd H. Davis, FES, Washington  
R. P. Davison, Ext., Vermont  
Dr. Johannes Delphendahl, University of Maine  
W. R. Dineen, Forest Service, Maine  
Donald T. Dinsmore, SCS, Maine



Mylo Downey, FES, Washington  
Richard F. Droege, Forest Service, Pennsylvania  
Dr. Eliot Epstein, University of Maine  
Herbert G. Folken, ARS, Washington  
Robert A. Farrington, F and P, Vermont  
Ted Fearnow, U.S. F.S., Upper Darby, Pennsylvania  
Donald S. Francis, Ext., Connecticut  
Raymond H. Freeman, FHA, New Hampshire  
Robert Gammons, Forestry, Maine  
Howard B. Goodrich, ASCS, Connecticut  
Carl F. Gordon, Ext., Vermont  
David Grimwood, SCS, Vermont  
Arthur Hart, Forestry, Maine  
A. F. Heald, ASCS, Vermont  
H. E. Hecker, SCS, Washington  
Mrs. Lois Hedges, Ext., Rhode Island  
V. Higbee, Ext., Rhode Island  
B. Higgins, Ext., Massachusetts  
J. V. Highfill, FHA, Washington  
Samuel W. Hoitt, Ext., New Hampshire  
Charles L. Holt, Ext., Maine  
Joseph A. Horn, ASCS, New Hampshire  
Fairmans Howard, SCS, Rhode Island  
Benjamin Isgur, SCS, Massachusetts  
Silas H. Jewett, Ext., Vermont  
R. Jones, U.S. Forest Service, Pennsylvania



Harry E. Keener, University of New Hampshire  
Sinclair F. Kenney, FHA , New Hampshire  
R. F. Kenyon, ASCS, Rhode Island  
Peter Jordon, Econ. Dev.  
Mrs. Louise C. Kilpatrick, Ext., New Hampshire  
Don Kirby, Water Resources, Massachusetts  
Leslie C. Kimball, ASCS, Massachusetts  
Herman A. Kruger, REA, New Hampshire  
H. C. Lamoreau, FHA, Maine  
Roger S. Leach, Ext., Maine  
Robert L. Leonard, Ext., Connecticut  
Nelson L. LeRay, Jr., Cornell, New York  
Ralph B. Littlefield, Ext., New Hampshire  
Henry F. Lowe, FHA, Maine  
E. Lyman, Ext., Rhode Island  
A. R. Mace, FHA, Maine  
R. W. Marquis,  
H. A. McKusick, Park and Forest, Connecticut  
V. P. McFadden, Maine  
K. Mergin, FS, USDA  
Perry H. Merrill, F and P, Vermont  
Francis Mahoney, Mass. Dept. of Natural Resources  
H. Mitchell, Forest Service, Pennsylvania  
Leonard R. Mitchell, Ext., Rhode Island  
Francis E. Montville, Ext., Maine  
Richard Moore, ASCS, Vermont





- 7 -

M. R. Mulholland, Forest Service, Massachusetts  
E. L. Newdick, Commissioner of Agriculture, Maine  
R. F. Nance, REA, Washington  
P. Newcomb, Federal Forest Service, Vermont  
Lemuel J. Peet, SCS, Vermont  
V. Phillips, ASCS, Washington  
B. Peterson, SRS, Massachusetts  
Dr. Louis Ploch, University of Maine  
Frank D. Pollard, RAD, Washington  
Professor Allan B. Prince, University of New Hampshire  
Boyd L. Rasmussen, Forest Service, Washington  
John L. Rego, Ext., Rhode Island  
James R. Roberts, AMS, Maryland  
Mrs. Helen Roberts, Ext., Greenfield, Massachusetts  
Frederic O. Sargent, Ext., Vermont  
Dr. Andrew J. W. Scheffey, University of Massachusetts  
W. F. Schreeder, Park and Forest, Connecticut  
Joseph A. Scungio, ASCS, Rhode Island  
James Sliney, ASCS, New Hampshire  
William W. Stone, Ext., Vermont  
E. Malcolm Strom, SCS, New Hampshire  
Margaret M. Sweeney, ASCS, Connecticut  
N. Paul Tedrow, SCS, Connecticut  
Enoch H. Tompkins, Ext., Vermont  
R. H. Treadway, ARS, Pennsylvania  
Richard H. Varney, Ext., Maine



H. Sidney Vaughan, Ext., Massachusetts

Silas B. Weeks, Ext., New Hampshire

E. C. Weitzell, FES, Washington

Roger D. Whitcomb, Ext., Vermont

George E. Whitham, Ext., Connecticut

James S. Wood, RAD, Vermont

Austin Wilkins, FS, Maine

Bruce Whitenight, ASCS, Washington

G. Wheeler, U.S. FS, New Hampshire



## OPENING REMARKS

R. P. Davison, Director of the Extension Service,  
University of Vermont, and Conference Chairman

### REGIONAL RAD CONFERENCE

Boston, Massachusetts

April 28, 1964

We are glad to welcome you people to this important Rural Areas Development Conference. This is the first time in my experience that I have seen such a wide cross section of USDA, Land Grant college, and interested state agencies all in one conference. This should mean that we will be able to fully carry the idea of strong interdisciplinary action in connection with rural area development work in the future.

Your planning committee after thorough discussion decided that the theme for this conference should be "Making RAD Work in New England." This is our first objective as far as this conference is concerned and as far as RAD work is concerned in the future.

Other objectives include:

(A) We should become fully aware of our opportunities to assist and contribute as agencies and organizations to the complete RAD process.

(B) We should learn and determine how we can make all agencies participate and work together to provide effective assistance to local groups in planning programs that lead to more jobs in the areas concerned, more family income, keeping the family farm intact as effectively as possible, and most important of all a really well planned use of land, water, and human resources.

Your planning committee hopes this will be truly a work conference. I suggest that we get out all sides of every question. In other words, let our hair down and talk family style relative to the problems we have, the irritations that may be bothering us so that in the long run we can get on with the work in a logical and effective manner.

We should from this conference be able to put down on paper our best thinking as to the problems we have and our ideas on how to solve them. These should be our guides when we get back home in helping to strengthen RAD work at that level.

We should get a sharp insight into interagency cooperation for such cooperation is necessary if the people we work with are to get the real benefits from the workers and agencies they support with their tax dollars.



My last thought in this connection is after we have let our hair down here for two days, let's at the close of the conference put it back up and go home and get on with the job of making RAD work in New England.

A word about your conference plans. We have arranged to have Mr. William Patrick of Sargent Shriver's staff be with us following the banquet. He will speak about the proposed Economic Opportunity Act, and specifically how it can relate to RAD work. We are fortunate to have Mr. Patrick with us and to be able to question a person who is working directly in Mr. Shriver's office in connection with this program.

I, finally, would like to pay special tribute to the members of the planning committee: Benjamin Isgur of SCS in Massachusetts; James S. Wood, Office of Rural Areas Development, Montpelier, Vermont; Henry F. Lowe of FHA in Maine; Nelson L. LeRay, Jr., ERS, Ithaca, New York; Leslie C. Kimball, Executive Director of ASCS in Massachusetts; R. F. Nance, REA, Washington, D. C.; Richard F. Droege of the Forest Service in Pennsylvania; M. Eldon Colby, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Washington, D. C.; and H. A. Keener, Director of Agricultural Experiment Station in New Hampshire. And I would like to give special thanks to Henry Lowe, Leslie Kimball, and Ben Isgur who have helped considerably with many of the details of getting ready for this important conference here in New England.

I hope that when the conference is over you will have felt the two days were well spent and that it will be helpful to all of us in bringing about a stronger interdisciplinary approach to planning activities and to making RAD work in New England.



X RURAL RENAISSANCE +

We have looked forward for several years to this particular series of Regional Rural Development workshops. We knew from the start they would be essential somewhere along the line to build upon experience a common understanding of concepts needed for even more united action in the future among Government agencies backstopping the development efforts of rural people.

We judged the right time would come sometime in the not-too-early stages of the RAD movement -- after nearly all of us had had some broadly representative experience -- but before we became too deeply concreted into isolated and partial thought patterns and traditions.

It takes a 6-or-8 months' lead time to plan, set up, and carry out an undertaking of this magnitude. You deserve commendation for superior social engineering to have timed this so well.

Our thanks are due the State Extension people and all of the State Technical Action Panel members who have worked in the Regional Planning Committees for the fine job they have done in developing these workshops.

Our thanks also to the people in Federal Extension Service who have taken the lead in organizing this series of workshops -- Dr. Brady, Dr. Davis, Everett Weitzell, Earl Pettyjohn, and the others -- and the USDA Administrators-- Godfrey, Bertsch, Si Smith, Clapp, Don Williams, Ted Byerly, Mace, Koffsky, Chief Cliff, Shaw, Knapp and the others -- and their co-workers -- who have given to the Steering Committee essential all-out cooperation.

### Responsive Democratic Government

I am not aware of any clashing of gears in the joint planning of these workshops. This speaks well for effective united future action. It also says strongly that you have already developed a close-knit harmonious RAD team.

Especially we are indebted to Dr. Lloyd Davis for the organizational and educational insights, principles and policies we will be discussing at these meetings. He has helped us greatly to think through the highly significant, and complex concepts of nationwide, local group action.

### Solid RAD Progress Is Underway

In 1963, more than 75,000 local people serving on about 2,500 unpaid voluntary area and county committees carried out projects that created an estimated 110,000 permanent new jobs. The latest quarterly report shows project completions jumped 25 percent in the first three months of 1964 over 1963. Altogether since the beginning of 1961, over 750,000 new non-farm jobs have been generated and farm income is up by more than one billion dollars per year.

### Educational Workshops for Professional Workers

This workshop is an educational meeting -- a meeting where top professionals are going to educate each other. It will be educational both for those of us who are privileged to attend -- and through us -- for those of our co-workers who cannot be here. All of the people in this room know more about RAD than any one of us does; we can learn from each other.

### I. RAD PRINCIPLES AND CONCEPTS

This keynote statement will attempt to state some of the fundamental concepts and principles. It is not a definitive comprehensive analysis of substantive content and issues involved in RAD and its programs.



Government RAD activities are an appropriate democratic outgrowth and response, through the American system of government and political policy-making, to the articulated and expressed aspirations, striving and felt needs of the people of rural America. Neither RAD as a whole, nor the Federal government's share in it, is something dreamed up by a detached group of master planners and then imposed on Rural America -- and it should not be. Rather, Federal RAD efforts are to direct outgrowth of those of the strivings of rural Americans that have been expressed by them, through their duly elected officials -- the President and the Congress. Before any Government activity started, the people had already taken the initiative; Government serves them as they direct. It is important to get our RAD roles as Federal and State government employees into proper perspective. Government is an instrument of popular action -- not its initiator, nor its dictator. Government programs make up but one of many instruments that people use to get done what they want to do.

#### Rural Aspirations

There is among the people of rural America a very basic concern for their rural communities; for the opportunities they provide; for the kinds of communities they are going to be, in which to live, work, and raise their families in the future. Rural people are much concerned about these questions. They talk about them in their local groups. They write about them. They vote about them. They have said they want their Federal and State governments to help try to make these the kinds of communities they want them to be.

Total development of the resources of an area must begin with people. Any plans for change must reflect the attitudes, the traditions, the values, and beliefs of local people.

We in USDA and the land-grant university system cannot manufacture the aspirations of rural people nor should we attempt to manipulate them. But we can -- as we are doing in RAD -- marshal the resources of the Department and other Federal and State agencies to help people develop new economic and social opportunities, improve living conditions, and use their resources for their own benefit.

Rural areas development is based on the initiative, drive, determination and decisions of local people and their organizations. No one in Washington -- or anywhere in government -- can -- or should -- attempt to -- develop a group or area that doesn't want to be developed, nor to dictate the direction of development.

#### Need for Continuous Adjustment and Adaptation

If government RAD services are to be of maximum aid to local people in development of their resources, we must strive continuously to adapt and adjust methods and procedures to fit local situations and problems -- to changing needs and new knowledge.

#### RAD is a Folk Movement of Grass Roots Action

Rural Areas Development is a nationwide effort of the people and by the people to develop the resources of their own areas to provide economic, educational, and cultural opportunities for those who wish to live there and their children. RAD is a folk movement by which the local people study their own resources and their own opportunities, take responsibility and initiative for making their own decisions as to what they want to do to develop their own future. It is a folk movement in which the people themselves have the initiative and the responsibility. It is a folk movement supplemented by the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture -- and other units of government -- as we make our services, our information, our know-how, our programs available to local people for them to use as they decide and as they see fit.



RAD is not a Government program of the U. S. Department of Agriculture -- nor any other Department of the Federal Government -- nor of any State Government. It is a nationwide effort by rural people themselves. In carrying out various phases of their development efforts, they may call upon their Federal, State and local governments for complementary educational, technical and financial resources not otherwise available within the area.

It must be recognized, therefore, that Governmental RAD activities are voluntary and supplemental -- not authoritarian, compulsory and preclusive. Initiated in rural America, backed up but not imposed by Washington.

#### No Centrally Designed Blueprints

No blueprints for rural areas are being drawn in Washington or anywhere else, except in rural America itself.

To try to develop area blueprints in Washington would result in faulty, inaccurate and unworkable plans. The data needed to intelligently develop rural America are not and cannot be available to any master planners in any central city.

Even if somewhat intelligent plans could be drafted, it is doubtful that the people of rural America would accept them.

And even if they could be sold, it would not be morally right, in a democracy, to do so.

#### Government Agencies

The role of the Government employees is symbolized by the name technical action panels -- the initials of which -- T. A. P. -- were chosen deliberately -- TAP -- signifying that we are to be on tap to serve the local people -- not on top of their decision-making processes.

There are some 40 programs in USDA -- and 200 or more in other Federal agencies -- they can aid rural people in solving these problems. Many State agencies and other public and private groups are ready and willing with still additional technical and financial resources to help.

There is -- and needs to be -- no rigid uniform national pattern of RAD terminology, organization or methods. Indeed, there should not be. Our States and counties vary greatly owing to differences in history, circumstances, traditions, structural organization and customary ways of doing things through social action.

Education, Technical Assistance and Financial Resources

If the local people are going to be able to do the job they want to do, they have a need for a great deal of knowledge and understanding. They need to know about the physical, human resources and institutional resources that exist in their community. They need to know about alternatives that are available to them in the development of these resources. They have to evaluate these alternatives. They have to know about the aids and services that are available from Federal, State and local government, as well as private sources, to help them do their job. They have to have some knowledge of future demands for the products and services that may be produced with the resources they have. They have to know something about how to proceed with the development that they decide upon.

Some of the possibilities for developing the local resources to benefit the people of the community may be in opportunities on which individuals can make decisions or take action in their own business operations. Others require group action. Some require action by Government. No matter what the action may be, those who are in a position to take the action must understand it, must make the decision to take the action, must have the confidence and motivation necessary to move ahead.

Group Action

Experience has shown that, in most rural areas, a very effective way of accomplishing this is to work with groups of people, with committees and organizations that involve many facets of the community's business, educational and other institutions. Experience has also shown that to work with such committees



and subcommittees that have special interests within the community is an effective way of getting broad understanding throughout the community, getting the support, the commitment, and the motivation for action that is necessary by many groups if we are going to have a broad-scaled development of the community's resources.

Such a structure of committees and groups we have referred to as Rural Areas Development committees. Many rural areas lack such an organization. In such communities an early step is an educational program that generates a desire in local people to form organizations through which they can work toward area development. Such an organization is most likely to be effective only when it is composed of local people who see the need, who are ready to work together, who are ready to spend the time, take the initiative, and accept the responsibility that will lead to success.

#### Each Area Is Unique

We recognize that all communities have some sort of institutional structure -- that this varies from area to area -- that there is in every community some past history of organization work that has an important effect on the creation and development of new organizations. There are many other variables in these rural communities; and all of these variables mean that we can't expect the people in each community to approach the job of organizing for Rural Areas Development in the same way, with the same kind of organization. We encourage local variation in the speed with which organization develops, and in the form that the organization takes. The important thing is that organization serves the needs of each particular community in attacking its problems of development.

Indeed, some communities are highly organized. In some communities there are long-established organizations working toward this goal of Rural Areas Development, and with a long history of accomplishments. It is obviously important that we recognize this existing structure and work with it rather than in competition with it. Competition with existing and established organization almost invariably results in reduced accomplishment in Rural Areas Development, rather than more.

#### Organizational and Educational Leadership

The organizational and educational responsibility delegated to the Extension Service requires a high degree of knowledge of existing community structure and leadership and a highly developed skill in working with the people, their existing institutions, in the development of whatever new structure may be required; in the evolution of old structure so as to help local people with their desire for progress.

In this connection, it seems important that our services be available to any and all local organizations that are working toward the improvement and development of the rural community, its people, and their resources. It does seem important that we encourage these various groups to work together through some sort of coordinating committee structure which may be called a RAD committee or known by some other name.

But here again, we should not allow our minds to become molded into rigid patterns. Some rural areas may well find that progress toward economic and social development will be more rapidly in the absence of any formal organizational structure at all.



### Results Not Harness

The payoff in RAD doesn't come with formation of committees or preparation of development plans.' The payoff comes when local people start doing things -- when cash registers start ringing more often -- when rural people begin to reap their fair share of our nation's economic growth -- where people learn to work together.

There is also a payoff for local groups when you as representatives of the Department of Agriculture and other agencies -- Federal and State -- begin to meet together more often and agree on changes in policies that should be made in your agency to better serve local people. Be articulate if you believe changes should be made -- we welcome your suggestions.

From the beginning, we have insisted that flexibility be a major characteristic of RAD. And the soundness of this approach has been proven by what's happening in rural America today.

### Structure and Methods Adopted by Area to Meet Its Needs

It is consistent with these basic principles and concepts, to suggest that county, area and State RAD committees, by whatever name, to be most useful in the area covered, should have such functions and structure as people in that area choose to organize, and find from experience, work best for them. These organizational tools must be tailored and constantly adjusted to the needs and experiences of the people whose aspirations and status are most affected.

### II. A NEW ERA OF HISTORY

All of us here are deeply committed by our jobs -- and dedicated by our devotion -- to the people of rural America -- and thereby to be leaders in a movement that is moving civilization into a new and higher plane of world history. We are participating -- we are deeply involved -- in a great historic movement by which our nation, and the other highly developed, highly industrialized

democratic nations of the free world, are moving into a new, more advanced stage of civilization -- a new age which future historians and sociologists will likely call "The Rural Renaissance."

Except for the 1/5 of our population that is needlessly caught in the coils of poverty, we are an affluent nation -- an affluent people.

And as our people become more affluent we find them looking to the open countryside.

#### A New Rural Era

Examine what observant sociologists, economists and land planners are reporting about the basic desires of American people -- about where we want to live and work and play.

First, as working hours grow shorter and wages and income rise and transportation facilities improve, the most rapidly rising trend has become a rush to the open countryside to recreate mind, spirit and body in healthful outdoor recreation. This is a constant phenomenon of every weekend, holiday, and vacation period. It means more visitors in rural areas and more jobs, businesses, and income to cater to their needs and desires. It, also, means that the human animal looks to the open country as his most congenial environment.

The second indication of the trend of civilization toward wanting to live in the open countryside is seen in the high social status of exurban living -- that is of moving to the open country out beyond suburbia. When families acquire sufficient income, and security with it, to live where they want to, we find that they often move beyond the suburban fringe into truly rural areas.



And the third indication is seen in the studies of the migration and resettlement of retired aging with sufficient income to live where they . Increasingly large proportions of retired Americans are moving to the small towns of rural America. In many rural areas these new retired settlers with their retirement checks, have provided the community new income equal to a new industry. Certainly these indications that a society where people are affluent enough, choose where they want to live, they often choose to live in or near the open country.

#### New Opportunity for Creative Living

No longer is it necessary for the factory, shop or market, by the need for power, be tied to the river waterfall, or by the need for communication and transport be tied to the harbor or railhead. Rural electrification, rural telephone systems and better highways and truck transportation on better roads have changed that. Now it is economically feasible for America's people to live and play where they seem to prefer -- in the rural countryside -- and to work where they want to live.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has called this possibility an exciting new dimension of advancing civilization. The probability that in our time our society will step up to a new and higher plane of creative living -- where all of us, who choose to, can live, play and work in the open countryside which very large proportion of our civilized man seems to prefer.

#### Characteristic of Advanced Stage of Civilization

This is neither a temporary nor a local phenomenon. (It is not confined to the United States alone.) Rather the hopeful climb into rural renaissance is widespread throughout those democratic nations of the free world that have reached a comfortable plane of personal, private incomes based upon a highly industrialized, highly automated and highly developed national economy.

Canada

Last summer I was privileged to spend a week in Canada where professional people and local and national leaders of that country were discussing their national Rural Areas Development program. It began about the same time as ours.

Western Europe

In October of last year, Administrator Lloyd Davis and I attended a week-long rural areas development seminar in Paris, France. Under the auspices of the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation, official representatives of all the highly developed, highly industrialized democratic nations of the free world, discussed national rural areas development programs now underway in their home countries.

Secretary Freeman recently served as chairman of the meeting in Paris, France, of Agricultural Ministers of these nations. The meeting adopted a broad statement of policy and concepts directing international attention to national rural areas development, including a hard hitting statement of need, means and methods for eliminating the causes of poverty among low income farm families.

Search to Revitalized Fundamental Values

These simultaneous developments in Canada and in the nations of Western Europe, and in the United States are not a case of one nation's following the lead of another. Rather, the response of democratic national governments to expressed needs of their rural people have simultaneously resulted in Governmental attention to rural areas development at this particular stage in their national life histories. All those nations have more or less attained the degree of material affluence afforded by the successful conclusion of the industrial revolution. Now they are reaching deeply back into their own culture to recapture the basic social values of their ways of life that have been threatened by rural decline in the four decades following World War I.



### Renaissance of Basic Democratic Value of Society

What is happening in all these highly developed, highly industrialized democratic nations at about the same time on their historic growth curves? First, they have recognized they lost something basic to their national being in their rush to become industrialized, to build huge cities and metropolitan areas and to increase so greatly their material levels of living by extension of scientific knowledge through widespread knowledge of improved technology. Rural institutions and values had been allowed to deteriorate and decay from neglect and inattention. Governments and peoples realized they had weakened some of the basic values of their society which were grounded in rural living and found their genesis there. In the course of it the heart of long held values of Western civilization itself were weakened and endangered.

### Democratic Governments Respond to Rural Aspirations

The people of rural areas throughout all these highly developed democratic nations, as in our own, became concerned about their future and the future of their communities. The concern of local people in rural areas is for the development of their communities to provide economic opportunity for their youth and to be the kinds of places in which they and their children will want to live and work. This common characteristic of all of the highly developed countries brought action.

These nations, being democratic are responsive to the expressed and felt aspirations of their people. They found it necessary and desirable to go back and rediscover, to rebuild and to strengthen the foundations of society itself. These, they discovered, were the very foundation values of rural life from which the beginnings of Western civilization sprang.

### III. RAD AIMS

Not only is the national striving of civilization to attain a rural renaissance widespread among the developed democratic nations -- also widespread among them is a similarity of aims that rural people and nations are striving to attain and to which national governmental efforts are being devoted.

In all these nations, the signals are clear, the rural aims for RAD can be stated about as follows:

1. Preserve and strengthen the family farm system of agriculture.
2. Increase the income of rural people and eliminate the causes of under-employment in rural areas.
3. Make continuous and systematic efforts to eliminate the many and complex causes of rural poverty.
4. Expand rural job opportunities through loans, grants, technical services, and training programs that create new factories, stores, trades, recreational enterprises, crafts, and services of all kinds.
5. Strengthen and expand opportunities for rural cooperatives.
6. Encourage more rapid development of recreation facilities on rural land to provide farmers and rural businessmen with a new source of income, and at the same time serve the needs of our growing numbers of urban population.
7. Encourage adjustments of land into patterns which utilize each acre and resource according to its full capabilities and treats each resource and acre as its unique needs require.
8. Provide technical and financial assistance necessary to conserve, use and develop soil, water, forest, fish and wildlife, and open spaces around our metropolitan centers.



9. Help rural people improve existing community facilities or, where needed, build new ones so that they have pure water supplies, first-rate schools and hospitals, adequate streets and roads, and other services that are standard in a modern community.

10. Develop new and improved opportunities for creative and satisfying rural life, work and recreation for all who choose it.

Secretary Freeman uses a definition of RAD which sums up these aims and aspirations in two sentences. He says:

"All the resources and agencies of the Department are contributing to this effort. It emphasizes the use, not idling of land; the development of communities, not their stagnation and decline. Its aim is a rural renaissance through a host of new opportunities in rural areas...ranging from on-farm recreation for pay to new industry...from improved housing to modern community water systems...from new ways to utilize what the land produces to more adequate supplies of water needed for industrial development. RAD seeks, in effect, to help the rural community compete not only for a fair share of our growing economy, but also for the affection of its own sons and daughters."

#### IV. VAST RESOURCE OF TRAINED LOCAL RURAL LEADERSHIP

As we move forward in the vast nationwide private and public RAD effort, we can be thankful of our inheritance of trained lay rural leadership. Thankful to the great leaders of the past, such as Presidents Franklin D. and Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson, Gifford Pinchot, and Under Secretary of Agriculture M. L. Wilson, and Extension Director Knapp and many others who initiated programs and ideas based upon faith in, and development of, independent informed local leadership.

All of you know the historic story. Soil and Water Conservation Districts and their elected boards of directors and supervisors; the thousands who have served on the boards of all kinds of rural cooperatives; farmer-elected county and community committeemen; the forestry organizations backed up by state foresters and conservation directors; the volunteer Extension advisory committeemen; local sponsors of watershed protection and rural renewal and resource conservation and development projects; and experienced officials of local government.

These hundreds of thousands of alert, informed, sophisticated, vigorous local leaders are not only an inheritance of resources of great current value and usefulness, they, also, are a resource upon which rural America can place increasingly great reliance in the future.

In particular, I should like to draw attention to three groups of these upon whom we have not called to the full measure of their capability -- rural cooperatives, soil and water conservation districts and the farmer-elected county and community committee.

#### V. HOMEMAKERS AND HOME ECONOMISTS

We are impressed at various meetings around the country -- political, organizational and others. Men seem to outnumber women at national, regional, statewide, and district meetings --- but it seems to be homemakers who attend local meetings in large numbers -- who do a large part of the work in the precinct and other local organizations.

President Johnson has recognized this nationally and increasingly is calling upon talented women to fill posts of high responsibility in the Federal Government.



Likewise in RAD we are finding that the women of rural communities are playing vital roles in making local RAD committees operate with aggressive, imaginative, humanity and creative vigor.

We are, also, impressed by the high priority and emphasized attention being given to RAD by professional home economists. This is good.

We need to take firm measures to utilize fully -- and to capitalize upon their recognized great talents, feeling for humanity, and competency.

## VI. OTHER QUESTIONS

When Everett Weitzell and Earl Pettyjohn and other members of the Washington Steering Committee were circulating among you in setting up this series of workshops, they picked up some questions you said you would like me to cover in this keynote statement.

### Agency Responsibilities

What are the roles of the various agencies? These are specified by law and by Department regulations. Each agency has its own assigned jobs to do and those demand and get its priority attention -- and should. All of them contribute greatly in educational, technical and financial resources in raising farm and rural incomes, improving housing standards, community improvement and human and natural resource development, conservation and multiple use.

You are familiar with these and I shall not list them.

With respect to organization and planning for development, the Federal-State Cooperative Extension Service has accepted the responsibility for leadership. All of the other agencies of the Department, as members of the Technical Action Panels, have made available their competencies in development planning and implementation.

A little more than three years ago some said it couldn't be done with existing agencies -- that to get a really meaningful effort to encourage, backstop and supplement local RAD effort, we would have to set up a completely new nationwide agency fully equipped with county, district, state and regional offices and transfer functions and funds to it from existing agencies that could and wouldn't rise to the challenge. We did not do so as, of course, you know.

The hard-hitting coordinated unified team operations that move RAD programs forward have justified our faith in your dedication, your will and your competence.

#### National RAD Boards, Committees and Councils

Another question that Everett and Earl brought back was: "What are all the various Washington level rural areas development committees and boards and where do they fit in?"

The Public Advisory Committee on Rural Areas Development is comprised of about 40 outstanding publicly-spirited national leaders drawn from all phases of rural life. The members meet about every three or four months, go over the results of RAD and future plans with a fine tooth comb; and advise the Secretary of Agriculture of what we are not doing that we ought to be doing; what we're doing that we ought to do better; and what we're doing that we ought to quit doing.

Similar public advisory committees give specific attention to (a) soil and water policy; (b) rural cooperatives, and multiple-use problems of the national forests.

The advice and counsel of these national leaders from outside government have been invaluable in developing and guiding the various RAD programs.



The President's Committee on Rural Development was established in the fall of 1963 by the late President Kennedy. The Secretary of Agriculture is Chairman and the Cabinet heads of all Federal Executive Branch Departments that have programs which can facilitate and encourage more rapid economy growth in rural areas are members. It serves as a coordinating mechanism to iron out difficult problems of need, emphasis and relationship involved in focusing all the efforts of the Federal government to make this maximum RAD contribution.

The RAD Council is an informally organized group composed of Administrators of USDA Agencies having a nationwide staff of field personnel working to help local folks meet their RAD goals. We meet only when there are significant issues of top importance requiring tough inter-agency decisions to be made of a policy or organizational nature.

The RAD Board is composed of representatives of all USDA Agencies that have an interest in and direct contributions to make to the RAD effort. This is the major staff arm of the Secretary's office in pounding out tough statements of proposed new and improved policies and the nature of action required to meet emerging new problems.

The Land and Water Policy Committee performs similar functions in the field of land and water resource development, use and conservation programs. Representatives of all the relevant Department agencies are members.

#### ORAD Field Staff

Another question you asked me to elucidate: "What is the function of the field representatives of the Office of Rural Areas Development and how do they fit into the administrative picture?"

ORAD field representatives are expeditors, bottleneck breakers, and pushers. In a limited sense, they are direct representatives of the Office of the Secretary and a sort of personal representative of the RAD Board Chairman to see to it that everything is done to facilitate and smooth out rough spots to make certain that the Department's effort with respect to the Area Redevelopment Act program, in the context of RAD generally, is being carried out with vigor and effectiveness. Their function is to facilitate and expedite your work, not to get in your way, not to supplement you or to be some kind of supervisor or super spy. Their job is to see that all bases are touched and all base paths are open for action.

Frank Pollard, Assistant Director of the Office of Rural Areas Development, is Chief of ORAD representatives.

#### VII. UNSETTLED ISSUES

You have sent to me many questions on unresolved issues complete answers to which are not yet crystal clear. On them we need your special advice and counsel. Some of these are:

"Realizing that improved farm income is basic to prosperity and faster development in most rural areas, what is the specific priorities and relationships between RAD and the important commodity programs?"

"Currently we're saying our policy is to encourage as much of improved operation of both that we can get -- leaving it to state and local RAD committees to develop the appropriate mix for their areas. Should we be more specific and rigid than this?"

"It serves no useful purpose to set up new farm and nonfarm enterprises that are economically unsound. Should we push inefficient sawmills just to get a good progress report?"



"Obviously not -- but how do you determine what is sound and unsound? Should local and state committees and TAP groups be given more specific and detailed instructions? In this connection with this, your attention is directed to Chairman's Instruction 64-22 which deals with one aspect of this problem. The key paragraphs read as follows:

"It is also recognized that some new enterprises may bring economic benefits to one area but create economic problems for another area. Therefore, rural development committees and technical action panels should take cognizance of possible competitive effects new enterprises may have on existing businesses.

"It is the policy of the nationwide Rural Areas Development Program that in approving projects for technical assistance grants and other financial aid, consideration shall be given both to the contribution to local economic growth and the contribution to national economic growth."

#### Overall Development Plans

"Should every county be encouraged or required to prepare an OEDP?"

"Currently we have not issued such a directive. We welcome your discussion and advice."

#### VIII. RURAL RENEWAL AREAS AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

And, finally, there seems to be some confusion as to the relationship of the new Rural Renewal Areas and Resource Conservation and Development Projects to RAD. There need be none -- the Rural Renewal Areas programs and RC&D projects were designed to fill the gap of unmet need for specially tailored Federal technical and financial resources in certain places where the previously existing programs are not sufficient to get the job done. RC&D and Rural Renewal are new tools in the RAD kit. They supplement, but do not replace, the regular RAD and TAP operation.

A similar organizational and local leadership problem will be faced when the new community action proposal is enacted. This, too, can and will be solved. I shall discuss it in greater detail at a later point in this keynote statement.

### IX. PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S WAR ON POVERTY

President Johnson has called for an all-out war on poverty as a "further step" in pursuit of this nation's goal of full and increasing opportunities for all citizens. "We seek," he said, "an America in which every citizen shares all the opportunities of his society, in which every man has a chance to advance his welfare to the limit of his capacities."

Many of you asked that I explain how the new poverty program will fit into RAD. The brief answer would be that we don't know for sure, of course. The proposed legislation has not been enacted yet. But that's not all of it. There has been a lot of preparatory work done and you ought to know about it.

In calling for an all-out war on poverty, President Johnson pointed out that 35 million men, women and children of the nation's population exist on per person income of \$590 a year. That is less than \$50 a month, and not quite one-third the per person income for the nation as a whole.

As you well know, nearly half of the nation's poverty is found among the rural one-third of the nation's total population.

All of you are already familiar with the proposed Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the background papers that have been prepared on the details of the proposed operation. Other speakers on your agenda will address themselves to this matter and you will be discussing it along with other concerns in your discussions and panel sessions.



However, it might be well in connection with the proposed new anti-poverty activity to indicate some general matters of broad organizational and agency interest.

Particularly I hope to reassure you that we are engaged in preparatory work to have relationships and patterns worked out and ready for action when the bill is enacted.

Providing ahead of time for an orderly pick-up we can avoid and eliminate useless and needless confusion, frustration and stalemate not only for the new activities but also the RAD work we already have underway.

Within the Department of Agriculture we have assigned liaison and coordinating activities related to the Jobs Corp (Title I, Part A of the Bill) to the Forest Service with help of the Soil Conservation Service.

Federal Extension Service has been assigned liaison duties with the Department of Labor, who will administer the work-training program (Title I, Part B).

The Cooperative State Research Service will be our representative in maintaining liaison with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which will administer the Work-Study Programs (Title I, Part C).

#### Title II, Community Action to Eradicate Causes of Poverty

It is our expectation that the Community Action programs provided in Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act will operate in rural areas along lines of the usual RAD patterns and channels. Within the Department of Agriculture we have asked the Federal Extension Service to encourage State Extension Service to take on the same leadership responsibility for education and organization with respect to the proposed new community action programs to eliminate poverty that they have already carried out with such great distinction and high competence in the RAD effort through educational and organizational leadership.

My personal prediction is that the attempt to develop and implement successful anti-poverty community action programs, in urban as well as rural areas, will mean that the special know-how, insights and energy of Extension in the organizational leadership field will be needed and called upon.

Title II provides the Community Action Program which would authorize special financial and technical assistance to a local government unit or a broadly representative community action organization to help it mobilize the community's resources to combat poverty. We believe that in some areas, the local RAD committee, if it wants to assume leadership in the poverty fight, will qualify as the community action organization. In other areas, the committee might have to be somewhat reconstituted to meet the qualification standards. Financial assistance under Title II would be 90 percent of the cost of the programs for the first two years and 75 percent thereafter.

Elimination of the complex causes of rural poverty has, as you know, always been a major aim of RAD, which operates through a community action structure. To be geared up to assume new anti-poverty responsibilities, RAD committees should have comprehensive poverty eradication plans ready for use, plans developed that involve the poverty-stricken themselves and are made in cooperation with local Government. Both State Governors and local government officials are being consulted in connection with this matter.

#### Added Tools for Farmers Home Security

Title III would provide a special program of rural loans and grants that will be administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

Title III includes special programs to combat poverty in rural areas. It would authorize grants of up to \$1,500 to low-income rural families to help them acquire or improve real estate, to improve the operation of family-sized farms, to participate in cooperatives, or to finance nonagricultural enterprises such as a recreation area, a home crafts business, a backyard



wood-working operation, or the like. These grants would be made only where there was a reasonable opportunity for effecting a permanent increase in the family's income level. There also would be loans of up to \$2,500 to help low income farmers finance nonagricultural enterprises, again with the stipulation that there would be every likelihood that the loan would bring about a permanent income gain. Other sections of Title III would provide loan and capital credit assistance to nonprofit corporations to acquire land to be consolidated or reconstituted into family farms, and provide loans to cooperatives who provide essential services to low income rural families.

Responsibility for liaison with the Department of Commerce and Small Business Administration in connection with the new special employment creating loans has been assigned to Rural Electrification Administration which is to carry out that responsibility now in connection with regular ARA and SBA loan programs.

Within the Department responsibility for liaison with the new Poverty War Volunteer Corp has been assigned to the Federal Extension Service, which together with the Cooperative State Extension Services, has the contacts of expertise and experience to carry out that function.

When enacted the proposed Economic Opportunity Act will provide important and significant new tools with which to enable rural Americans to move more rapidly to the full attainment of their RAD aims. We hope that the adoption and use of the new tools can be taken in stride and put into use with a minimum of delay and clashing of gears. It is our intention that this be so. It can be done. It will be.

#### X. PEOPLE AND WHY WE ARE CONCERNED

The purpose in view of resource development in rural areas is to enable rural Americans and include all Americans to step up to the higher plane of a new era of history.

Our people are surging toward a rural renaissance -- unwilling to accept rural decline as inevitable -- striving to move into the new age of history whose abundance has put a new kind of creative living well within the threshold of probability..

The developed democratic nations of the world are thrusting into a rural renaissance of creative living because their peoples demand it. To move with the grain of history, when it is moving in the right direction, is certainly more constructive than moving against it.

As we join the move of the nations to a new and higher plane of civilized living, we must in all our thinking and working professionally and personally bear always in mind that at center stage, with hopeful look on his face is the individual human being.

Truly, each person has a unique worth that makes all our efforts worthwhile.

-----



-37-  
HOW TO MAKE RAD<sup>1/</sup> WORK  
(In Northern New England)

Frederic O. Sargent<sup>2/</sup>

Economic development, both domestic and foreign, is absorbing an ever-increasing amount of funds, interest, and personnel. In studying and working on economic development problems, domestically and in foreign countries, I am struck with the contrast between the two situations. The underdeveloped country which is struggling to achieve economic development usually has a host of obstacles to overcome—lack of capital, ignorance, disease, poverty, poor transportation, obsolete technology, unstable government, and inefficient institutions.

In contrast, people in a rural area of the United States who wish to inaugurate an economic development program have everything in their favor—easy access to low-cost capital, dozens of highly trained prepaid government experts, an excellent and improving transportation system, and an educated labor pool. In spite of their handicaps, many underdeveloped foreign countries have achieved, and are achieving, economic development. If these foreign underdeveloped countries suffering from the multiple dilemmas of the vicious circle of low productivity can achieve takeoff, then, certainly, any rural area in the States should be able to achieve development with everything in its favor. This, in fact, is my premise. Rural area development in New England is a relatively simple matter. The methods are known to all who have studied the subject. Technical and professional personnel and capital are available. All that is necessary is for the responsible people to put the ingredients together in accord with economic principles and successful previous experiences.

Rural area development is a complex process but it is not an unknown process. Our rural economy in the United States has been studied intensively for several decades by researchers of several disciplines in our state Experiment Stations.

---

<sup>1/</sup> RAD stands for rural area development. It is the phrase and initials used by the Extension Service to refer to rural area development activities recognized by the Extension Service. For many it implies all rural area development work of whatever auspices. In fact, there is a great deal of rural area development work not recognized as such by the Extension Service. In this paper I am using the larger meaning of RAD in discussing the whole gamut of rural area development programs.

<sup>2/</sup> Land Economist, Vermont Resources Research Center, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont. Prepared for a New England Conference on RAD, Boston, Massachusetts, April 28-29, 1964.



These studies provide us with the knowledge that any area with a development potential, given certain preconditions, can achieve rural area development by following proven procedures. I would like to discuss briefly the necessary precondition for area development and the three indispensable steps.

The major precondition for economic development in rural America is that there be a genuine desire to achieve rural area development at the three levels of government—local, state, and national. In the decade before World War II, there was a major rural area development planning program. However, in Northern New England it came to naught. While the federal government strongly supported the program, there was inadequate support at the state and local levels. Today, there is much more interest in rural development planning at all three levels. The federal government is demonstrating unprecedented interest in area development through special programs sponsored by more than half a dozen federal departments. Interests in, and desire for, rural development at the local level varies greatly from place to place. It is obviously intense where local people have participated in making intensive studies of all aspects of their rural economy in the hope of thereby qualifying for grants from the federal government or in an effort to improve their local region. There are a number of areas in Northern New England where local interest has been amply demonstrated.

State level interests in rural development also vary considerably. The intensity and degree of state interest in rural area development can be clearly and accurately measured by the amount of personnel and appropriations allocated to rural area development. We know from wide experience that rural regional development can succeed only when full-time specialists are provided to assist local efforts and provide liaison with state and federal agencies and services. The need for assistance gives us a useful measure of the seriousness of interests in rural area development in any state. If full-time rural area development specialists are provided in each development area by a state or state and federal agency, then it is clear that there is an adequate interest in the program. If, however, responsibility for rural area development is added to the assignment of busy public servants who are not simultaneously relieved of other duties, then it is evident that the agencies concerned are not sufficiently interested in rural area development.

When there is a genuine interest in area development at all three levels, then it is only necessary to follow three steps to achieve a higher level of living. The steps are: (1) study others' experiences and attempt to profit by them, (2) work toward coordination and cooperation among state and federal agencies, and (3) follow the proven principles of rural area development and adopt procedures consistent with those principles.



### Study Others' Experiences

While economic area development is a relatively new subdivision of the social sciences, it is a science to the extent that we can learn valuable lessons from pilot studies and experiences in other states. To make rural area development work in New England, it is necessary to study the experiences of nearby states and provinces to see what can be learned about organization, procedures, surveys, research studies, planning, and implementation.

Every state that has undertaken rural area development has contributed something to the general knowledge and provides lessons for others. Maine has had valuable experience in the pilot rural area development program in Washington County. From that experience we can learn the value of an intensive pilot program for training personnel. We can learn the effect it had on attitudes of people, especially attitudes of young people. We can learn the significance of a small increase in employment in an underdeveloped rural region and many other lessons.

In New Hampshire, although experience in rural area development is based on a short period of time, there are a number of lessons that can be learned. One of the lessons to be learned is the importance of recognizing recreation as a major economic development component and the desirability of incorporating plans for parks and recreation facilities into all area development programs. Also from New Hampshire it is possible to learn how to make Public Law 566 work with strong support from the Water Resources Department and with cooperation among the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the State Planning Office. We may also be able to learn something about the desirability of maintaining public access at public financed water reservoir projects and the means for doing this.

New York State provides an example of selling the electorate on the need for an intensive comprehensive campaign to develop park and recreation facilities of all kinds at all types of locations and of implementing such a program with adequate funds. I am sure we can benefit by studying and emulating that example.

The Province of Ontario has one of the best lessons for anyone in the U.S. interested in rural area development. Ontario developed rural area development districts on a watershed basis. These districts incorporate a multiplicity of purposes—flood control, water conservation, recreation, land use demonstrations, minimum flow maintenance, and historic site preservation. The development programs for these districts have the support of many disciplines. The program is financed by balanced financial support from each of the three levels of government. The financial contribution from each level of government is significant and not just a token contribution.



This division of costs guarantees genuine interest at all levels. I recommend a study of the Ontario Conservation Authorities to anyone looking for a successful model. The Ontario program is based on American experience. The Ontario lawmakers studied U.S. trials and errors and developed a program by selecting the best from U.S. experiences.<sup>3/</sup>

Valuable lessons concerning methods of rural development may also be learned from New Brunswick. One notable lesson to be learned there is the contribution that self-help in the form of cooperatives can provide in raising the economic level of a depressed region. I was reminded of the New Brunswick experience recently when a group of maple product producers were complaining about the lack of a protective tariff while rejecting any suggestion that cooperative marketing could help them. It is a fact that in Quebec, where the maple product competition comes from, a maple cooperative is one of the principal agencies which has developed the sales of the Canadian maple sugar and syrup. The employment of self-help schemes such as cooperatives is a weak part of our approach and of our programs in New England.

While I am focusing my remarks on Northern New England and neighboring provinces, it is recognized that other states have had recent experiences in area planning which are informative to study. The use of professional planners in the state planning program and the open-space program in Connecticut are worthy of study. Rhode Island provides a good example of how economic impact studies can contribute basic data and understanding required in area planning. In Massachusetts we should carefully appraise the conservation districts as a useful vehicle for land use planning. Also the Water Resources Commission provides an example of state coordination of water resource management and planning.

If there is something that Vermont can contribute to an understanding of how to make area development work it might be in illustrating ways in which research can be designed to support area development. As a result of the state planning program and HHFA financing, a half dozen research projects have been developed which make direct contributions to area development planning. Some of these projects which have produced information indispensable to area planning concern local taxation and expenditures, trends in land use, recreation,

---

<sup>3/</sup> See "Planning in the Thames River Valley," by Edward G. Pleva, in Regional and Resource Planning in Canada, Krueger, Sargent, de Vos, and Pearson (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, Limited, 1963).

and the demarkation of economic regions.<sup>4/</sup> While the results of this research is proving valuable, of equal importance is the fact that the conduct of the research has developed specialists on the research subjects who are available to consult with area associations.

To summarize this first step, it is necessary to study the experience of others so that we can profit by their successes, avoid their mistakes, and achieve new insight into the process of area development. A series of monographs on these experiences written to inform RAD technicians would be helpful.

---

<sup>4/</sup> Resources research projects in progress (Vermont Resources Research Center):

1. Changes in Vermont's Population and Their Effect Upon the State's Agriculture and Rural Communities - Enoch H. Tompkins.
2. Vermont Agriculture—It's Past, Present, and Future - James G. Sykes and Verle R. Houghaboom.
3. The Changing Agricultural and Land Use Patterns in Individual Vermont Towns - Malcolm I. Bevins.
4. The Social and Economic Effects of the Ski Industry Upon Selected Vermont Communities - Enoch H. Tompkins and Malcolm I. Bevins.
5. An Analysis of State and Local Taxation and Finance - Robert O. Sinclair and David A. LeSourd (Commerce and Economics).
6. The Outdoor Recreation Industry in Vermont - Malcolm I. Bevins and Frederic O. Sargent.
7. Resources of Vermont—Their Nature, Extent, Management, and Development Potential - Frederic O. Sargent.
8. Land Use Trends in Vermont - Frederic O. Sargent and Dwight K. Eddy.
9. Identification of Regions in Vermont - Enoch H. Tompkins, Frederic O. Sargent, Edward J. Miles (Geography), and Paul Dunham (Government Research Center).



## Achieve Coordination

The second step in making rural area development successful in Northern New England is to achieve coordination and cooperation among state and federal agencies. This may take some doing. The critical limiting factor in rural area development at the present time consists of the extreme inefficiencies caused by the multiplicity of federal agencies active in rural area development. Just to list the federal agencies with active, competing programs in area development should be enough to convince anyone of the severity of this problem. The U.S. Department of Commerce has the Area Re-development Act; the U.S. Department of Defense has a Corps of Army Engineers which contracts for comprehensive planning programs; the Housing and Home Finance Agency offers a two-to-one subsidy for local, regional, and state planning; the Small Business Administration also has attractive loans; and the U.S. Department of Agriculture has two separate and non-coordinated programs—the "RAD" program sponsored by the Extension Service and the RC&D program sponsored by the Soil Conservation Service.

Unfortunately, all of these agencies have not followed the directives which have emanated from Washington advising them to work together smoothly. A specific case of interagency competition ad absurdum will illustrate this point. The Corps of Army Engineers is authorized and financed by Congress to make a "comprehensive" plan for development of water resources in the Connecticut River basin. To implement this assignment, they have let a contract for a comprehensive economic survey to Arthur D. Little. They have an informal letter of agreement with the Economic Research Service in Washington for an economic survey of agriculture in the area. They have a contract with the U.S. Geological Survey in Boston for ground water surveys. All of this activity would be wonderful if it wasn't for three facts: (1) the states of Vermont and New Hampshire both have their own planning programs which are duplicating many large sectors of these other studies; (2) agencies outside the area cannot make significant contributions to understanding the economy of the area when working in competition with state Experiment Stations and professional researchers within the area (The ERS in Upper Darby is making economic studies uncoordinated with similar work by the Vermont Experiment Station); and (3) the Corps that is supervising this comprehensive planning does not have the qualified personnel necessary to supervise comprehensive economic development planning. (Two of the economic base studies cover different geographical areas.) The result is that the many studies subcontracted to various distant agencies will not, and do not, add up to an integrated study or plan. If recent evidence is needed of this method of reductio ad absurdum, I would refer to the studies already completed by the Corps' subcontractors and coworkers (A. D. Little and ERS). These studies have been made on the basis of data which is not complete enough or detailed enough to provide the framework for a planning program.



It is not my intention to specifically cite any single agency over any other as being guilty of lack of coordination and guilty of introducing the gross inefficiencies attendant upon competition in research among public agencies. The reason I cited the Corps perhaps is because it has the longest record of violating all the major precepts of the scientific research method in its studies<sup>5/</sup> and the fact that it has conducted previous studies on the Connecticut in which the value of the study was not commensurate with the millions of dollars spent and the time spent in making them. (Also perhaps because I am addressing a USDA audience.)

The point I wish to make is that area development is a three-legged stool. The three legs represent local organizations, state agencies, and federal agencies. All three legs must be upright and working together to support a rational program. This problem is especially critical now that we have state planning programs. The federal programs must be coordinated with, and meshed with, the state planning programs. Those who emphasize the grass roots to the exclusion of state agencies do a disservice to the people.

### Follow Established Principles

The third step in making rural area development successful in Northern New England is to follow the established principles of rural area development.<sup>6/</sup> A principle is a general proposition which experience has proven to be generally true and a useful basis for action. In all of the experiences in neighboring states, throughout the country, and in other countries, a number of principles have been demonstrated to be valid. These principles apply to economic problems, to administrative procedures, and to methods of study. Let us cite some of these principles which, if followed, will assure that the end result will be increased jobs and increased levels of income for people in the planning area.

One of the most obvious and universally recognized principles is that economic development of a rural area must be based on economic principles. This sounds like a tautology, and in fact it is, but it must be mentioned because there are recent instances in which local people have been encouraged to bring about rural area development by a boot-strap method

---

<sup>5/</sup> See Frederic O. Sargent, "The Prospects of the U.S. Water Study Commission for Texas," Southwestern Social Science Quarterly (September 1960).

<sup>6/</sup> See Frederic O. Sargent, "Six Principles of Rural Development," Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Volume IX, No. 2 (1961).

which has ignored reference to economic principles. Of the many contributions that economics can make, one is that of delineating a potentially viable regional planning area. Consideration of this principle will avoid pitfalls such as organizing people on a county or watershed basis that cuts across or violates social and economic area patterns, or attempting to organize development in an area with a resource base which is insufficient for the level of development anticipated.

Another equally well-established principle which is also sometimes ignored is the multiple discipline principle. Rural development is a complex process. To solve its problems, it is necessary to combine, in a working framework, the talents of the soil scientist, the forester, the rural sociologist, the economist, the hydrologist, the political scientist, the planner, and the engineer; to name most of the major disciplines concerned.<sup>7/</sup> When federal and state agencies are not coordinated, this principle is violated. TAP's alone are not sufficient. They must be supplemented by technical assistance from state agencies.

Another well-proven principle is that research is necessary to provide a sound basis for area development. Research not only provides indispensable knowledge concerning the area but also makes it possible to ask the right questions and develop the right hypotheses for the future development of a region. For instance, it is indispensable in planning the development of a rural area to know the source of income of the people in that area. Without research, this will not be known. The census and other secondary sources and reports of consultants based on these secondary sources are inadequate in answering basic questions concerning the present sources and levels of income of open-country residents.

The development of research in support of rural area development is a major weakness in Northern New England at present. What is needed is something more than just conventional studies of sources of income, land use, land values, tourism, recreation, farm abandonment, taxation, and town finances. There is an acute need for some experimental research to test hypotheses concerning new ways for rural people to increase their incomes. Unfortunately, the experimental method is not popular today and few economists and development specialists are trained in its use.

---

<sup>7/</sup> See Frederic O. Sargent, "Economic Analysis in a Political Framework," Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, Vol. 17, No. 2 (March 1962).



Another basic principle which has been derived from research on a multiple discipline basis is that land classification should be the first step in a rural area development program. All the major disciplines concerned with area development agree that the first step in a rational program is to classify the resource base according to present use and according to potential uses within the framework indicated by an economic analysis of the region. One of the best land classification systems for rural area development is the one developed by G. Angus Hills of the Department of Forestry in Ontario. His system has been used several times. The latest example is in the Tweed rural development studies in Ontario. Rural development without land classification runs the danger of badly missing some major development potentials. Fragmentation of responsibilities and assignments among federal agencies precludes a coordinated multiple purpose, multiple resource classification.

A fifth well-established and often demonstrated principle is the necessity for coordination among the agencies concerned with rural development. Agencies within the USDA must work together as a single agency if rural development is to be achieved efficiently. There must be coordination among state agencies. This will be especially difficult if they have a long history of operating separately. The problem of obtaining coordination among federal agencies (mentioned above) may seem like an extremely difficult problem to solve. However, if coordination can be achieved at the state level, it will be possible to force coordination at the federal level by taking the initiative in guiding and leading the area planning and development program.

The principle of the necessity for coordinated management has special significance in Northern New England. Coordination must be interstate when economic regions are interstate. To be more specific, the whole Connecticut River basin must be studied and developed on the basis of natural existing economic regions, most of which are interstate. Anyone promoting and fostering development of single state regions along the Connecticut is probably doing a disservice to the people and preventing future maximum development of the area.

To summarize, I believe that in contrast to the problems of underdeveloped countries, it is relatively easy to make rural development successful in Northern New England. All that is required is to satisfy one precondition and to take three simple steps. The precondition is that there be a genuine interest in area development at all three levels of government. Interest at the state level or state-federal level is signified by the allocation of personnel to work full time in each area. When this precondition is met, area development will succeed (1) if the experience of nearby states is studied; (2) if cooperation and coordination is achieved among state agencies, and if debilitating competition is eliminated among federal agencies; and (3) if the proven elementary principles of rural area development are followed.

Of all of these steps, the weakest link and the limiting factor at the present time appears to be in the area of coordination among federal programs and interstate cooperation with reference to the Connecticut River basin. Since this, as well as other obstacles to making RAD work in Northern New England, can be removed without any changes in the present framework, it appears that we are on the verge of a great leap forward in economic development of Northern New England.



X MAKING RAD WORK IN SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND +

There is a real question as to whether RAD can be made to work in southern New England. If we will design the program and the organization to fit the region's particular needs, it will work here. If we undertake only the conventional activities it will fail. I think, for example, that it would be a waste of time to concentrate on organizing RAD committees at the local level. I think also that the preparation of Overall Economic Development Plans by such committees would be an exercise in futility.

Southern New England is a part of Megalopolis and if we have any "Rural" problems they tend to be strongly influenced by our urban-industrial economy. We need to take a broad view in planning for economic development of this region, but while the view must be broad, the mechanisms for planning must be selective. We won't get much to happen by using the planning equivalent of the colonial musket.

We can agree, I think, that there is a great need for local leadership of the developmental efforts, but there is some question as to whether the local RAD committee is the best way to get it. The local RAD committee, I am afraid, is already obsolete in terms of our region's contemporary needs.

Rural Areas Development is a lineal descendant of the Land Use Planning Program of the mid and late 1930's. The primary means to Rural Areas Development is the county RAD committee which is a reincarnation of the County Land Use Planning Committee of that golden age.

LAND USE PLANNING FAILED

It was a golden age. Those of us who were involved in that first effort at local level rural economic planning will never forget the excitement of hundreds of community and county planning meetings where local people began to grapple with economic problems, and began to discover that as individuals, they had not only some responsibility for their social and economic environment, but also some power over it. In those years, lights burned late in school houses and meeting halls all over this country as committees of farmers studied the problems of their communities and counties, and tried to fashion solutions to problems they felt, but could not solve within the fences of their individual farms.

In Massachusetts the high-water marks of this planning effort were the intensive programs in the Worcester county area. Yet, this early planning work in Massachusetts and in the rest of the nation has disappeared almost without a trace. If we are to make RAD work in southern New England, or anywhere else for that matter, we need to understand why Land Use Planning failed. There were several reasons.

- - - - -  
Paper given by John Blackmore, Head, Department of Agricultural and Food Economics, at New England RAD Conference - Boston, April 28, 1964





It failed, in part, because of our involvement in 1941 in a great war. There was no time then for long range planning on anything except the winning of the war. This early planning effort failed, too, because of the position of some farm groups and some federal agencies. Secretary Wallace, in establishing the program of county and state planning had hoped that the structure of planning committees could be a device through which local rural people could make their needs and opinions felt by the agencies of the federal government. Some groups saw this system of committees as a threat to their own positions as reflectors of local opinion in Washington. Some administrative officials of the USDA action agencies saw the local and state planning committees as being in conflict with the more specialized local and state groups representing the clients of the particular agencies. The Congress received little encouragement for continuing appropriations for the planning work during the war period from either the farm groups, or the action agency officials.

Still, the state and local planning program would not have been swept away so easily if it had not been already fading. By 1942, it had clearly lost its momentum, and in my judgment, for two overriding reasons; (1) it had been built upon the energy and knowledge of purely voluntary, unpaid, part-time local leaders.

The voluntary committee is a good device for studying and getting action on many kinds of local problems, particularly those that can be solved in a fairly short time and on the basis of readily available technical information. Unfortunately, the Land Use Planning committees of yesterday and in southern New England the RAD committees of today, have few such problems to solve.

Most of the problems of rural area economic development in southern New England are technically complex. The necessary data on them are usually not readily available and the time required to get decisions and action on them is very great. The Land Use Planning committees ran out of steam and they ran out of technical information. Their earlier successes were on problems, ripe for solution. These were problems on which there was considerable local knowledge and for which the solution could be obtained by easily made decisions of responsible public officials.

When the easy problems were out of the way, the committee members became gradually aware that their local economies rested upon a terrible tangle of imperfectly understood problems. Continued study of some of these problems produced little more than knowledge that there was need for study and research beyond the technical competence and financial ability of the local committee. Such study in other cases illuminated the fact that the problem solution would require, weeks, months or even years of effort by the local leaders and it simply was not worth it. Committee meetings became fewer and attendance fell off as the difficulties became clearer.

In the Rural Areas Development program we are building upon sand in our efforts to develop volunteer, unpaid, part-time local committees as the primary device for planning and action. They will fail in southern







New England just as the Land Use Planning committees finally failed. I suspect that awareness of this is a primary reason for the lack of enthusiasm in the region for the whole program.

(2) The Land Use Planning Program failed for another reason, too. Its local and state committees were purely advisory. They had no economic or political leverage. They could persuade and recommend, but they could not act. It is no wonder that committee members grew discouraged when they saw their reports, the results of so much thought and work, dismissed or ignored by those who could make the needed decisions and take the needed action.

Rural Areas Development requires that the local organizations responsible for it have some means of stimulating action on their plans.

I have little to say about OEDP's. What useful purpose do they really serve in this region, except to have something to send to Washington as visible evidence of a planning activity? Local energy and leadership is too precious a commodity to be used this way. It should be focused on getting local action on solvable problems.

#### RAD'S OBJECTIVES

With this background we can move on to try to clarify a few troublesome problems relating to RAD. The first of these is the overall objective. What is the objective of RAD? I have the impression that the real, though unstated objective is simply to do good in rural areas, to do what ever seems needed in the economic and social interests of rural people. This is a commendable objective, but is it realistic for our region? Some kinds of problems of people living outside our cities hardly seem amenable to solution by the RAD device. Our regional economy is so complex and so urban-industrial in its orientation that a conventional program of Rural Areas Planning seems pretty inadequate. It seems hardly practical to embrace the whole of regional economic development in a RAD program. It seems a bit presumptuous in this region for persons with a primary concern for the non-urban sectors of the economy to undertake to wag the whole dog. The future economic development of southern New England will depend in large part upon some private decisions and public policies that I don't think we want to spend our time on, as, for example, National Defense Policy, the general structure of the national transportation system and its rates policies, the costs of electric power and other energy sources and industrial wage policies.

I suggest that we narrow the focus of RAD for this region to one major problem area. Our general perspective, of course, should be to contribute to the region's future economic and social development, to maintain this region as one of the relatively high income parts of the nation, and at the same time provide the kind of environment for human life that really satisfies man's basic needs.\* We should operate within

---

\*For an admirable discussion of this see Sanford S. Farness' paper entitled "Man-Environment Problems in an Urban Age" in Chapter One, Approaches to Resource Planning, Publication 410, Resources, the Metropolis, and the Land Grant University, University of Massachusetts, 1963





this kind of framework, but we should concentrate our attention on one of the region's major problem areas, the one we are best equipped to work on.

Our economy has three broad problem areas--manpower, capital, and physical inputs or natural resources. Let us leave practically all of the manpower problems to others, and most all of the capital investment problems, too. Let us concentrate on the one remaining area, our natural resources that contribute to the economy, and in particular to the land--to open space. By open space I mean all of our region's share of the earth's surface not already permanently committed to strictly urban uses.

### THE OPEN SPACE CHALLENGE

There is certainly enough to do in this problem area and it is one for which our society lacks adequate social machinery. It is true that we have a number of local planning and conservation bodies in southern New England and a great number of deeply concerned private citizens. We do not, however, have as yet, a set of sufficiently powerful devices to really guide the future use of our remaining open space to best serve our social needs. Nor are we alone in this. Other densely populated, industrialized, urban areas of the nation are finding that the process of economic development provides high individual incomes, but it destroys open space. More exactly, it utilizes open space in ways that may maximize productivity and income of individuals, but it often minimizes other values. Planning Boards, Zoning, and such devices have proven inadequate to control the immense economic pressures that can build up for open space conversions in our kind of region.

The need for some effective means for guiding the future use of our open space should be clear enough. This is truly our scarce resource. We can look forward to a growing human population. A trained, skilled supply of manpower of growing size is a reasonable possibility, so is increasing supply of investment capital. On the other hand, there are limits to the supply of open land.

### HOW TO BE EFFECTIVE

The next problem is how can society exert a positive and effective influence upon the future use of open space? We could devote a great deal of time to a measured consideration of present devices for this purpose, but I will simply reject them as being inadequate for the job. Zoning ordinances have a fine record of being effective except where they are most needed; that is, when the opportunities for private gain from land use change is very great. For the most part, local planning bodies perform needed and valuable services. In the future we need more land use planning, not less. We need more careful studies of alternatives, more detailed information on the resources and their use potentials, more exacting evaluations of the economic consequences of alternative plans.





The difficulty with zoning and present planning machinery is that it was not designed to take adequate account of the operations of another social device, a much more ancient and venerable institution--the free market for land. We treat land as being just another economic commodity. It is deeply ingrained in our western culture to do so. Even to suggest that this mechanism might be questioned will surely make most people uncomfortable.

We must make ourselves a bit uncomfortable. We must take a long hard look at this social device that in an earlier time was a magnificent means to a socially desirable kind of economic development. Again, we could stop and devote a great deal of time to the strengths and weaknesses of the free market for land, but this must await another occasion. I hope it is enough to say this economic institution operates in the private interest and fails largely to meet the present public need.

We no longer permit such market mechanisms to solve some other kinds of public decision problems. At one time we permitted individual householders to decide how to dispose of their household wastes. We let private economic considerations rule. One of the attributes of our urbanizing society, however, is the sewer. The individual uses this social device whether he wants to or not. Increasingly, too, we deny industrial firms the right to minimize their private costs by dumping raw industrial pollutants into streams or into the air. A democratic society, when the social need becomes great enough, does modify its social institutions and policies. We are, whether we realize it or not, beginning to modify the operations of the market for land.

It should be clear now as to what is the task to be done under the banner of Rural Areas Development. The really strategic job relating to the region's economic development is the matter of allocation of the scarce open space among competing uses. Unless we find some better way to do this, southern New England will likely become a vast, perhaps productive, slum. We can ignore our open space problems and probably achieve goals of continued high per capita income at least for industrial workers, but we stand to lose a great deal in terms of non-economic satisfactions. We would also stand to lose a significant part of our economic productivity, that of agriculture, most of the economic activity generated by tourists attracted by the esthetic charms of our region, and we would surely raise the costs and diminish the quality of our food supply.

In tackling the problem of open space we concentrate our attention on a set of problem areas where there is the most professional back-stopping available in the state universities and federal agencies. Little enough is known about our open space problems, but we are much better equipped to begin with them than with such problems as manpower retraining, industrial redevelopment, mass transportation, or urban renewal.

Open space problems are a part of the fabric of economic development, but they can be separated from other problems for treatment. It should be possible to devise a mechanism for the study and resolution of these problems, taking full account of other aspects of economic development and full account of the activities of other agencies and bodies concerned with economic development.







The solutions to the very difficult choice problems we face in relation to scarce open land can be found only if there is some concentrated attention on them in the form of research, land use planning and through evaluation of alternatives. Only if there is some special mechanism set up for dealing with our open space problems, will we find satisfactory solutions to them.

If rural area development is to succeed in this region, considerably more is needed than the organization of interested rural leaders into volunteer committees for the purpose of making recommendations as to what should be done. We already have, at least in Massachusetts, a great deal of local organization. What is needed is a clear designation of responsibility and authority to such local bodies to not only plan, but to act. These local bodies will need massive amounts of technical information. They will need new legislative authorizations, too. There will be, I believe, need for action by each of the legislatures in the region to give needed authority relating to use of open space to appropriate arms of the state government and to local bodies.

#### PROPOSAL - A PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROJECT FOR EXTENSION

The needed legislation can be prepared only if there is first a program of intensive study of the region's open space problems, and the organization of this study effort might well be the first task of the cooperative extension services in the region. Each state director should appoint a full-time leader for a new extension project--a public affairs project directed specifically at the region's open space problems. The project leader, and such assistants as can be made available to him, should organize a study program that reaches into every level of the society. There should be a study group, or seminar, for state officials and there should be a host of study committees at the local level. Every town which still has some open space should have at least one, made up of persons with real influence in public affairs.

The programs for the study groups might be modeled after the very successful "operation advance" in New York State or similar efforts in a half dozen other states. A great deal of the effort of the state specialists working on the project will be needed for the preparation of the study guides and background materials. The success of the New York effort, and of that of other states in the public affairs field rests on a foundation of careful preparation of the basic materials for the discussion groups.

We should expect that a program of study of this kind will be needed for two or three years before it begins to produce fruit in the form of plans for social mechanisms that will be effective in guiding the allocation of our scarce open space in ways that yield the maximum economic and social returns. There is no way to hurry the process. Rural area development for southern New England must, of necessity, involve some more interference with the operations of the economic market for land and before people will permit any substantial adjustments in this ancient institution, there must be a long and intensive program of education relating to the region's open space problems and future development needs.





### PLANNING AND ACTION

Still, a program of public affairs education is not a program of rural area development, it only prepares the way for it. A development program requires two additional activities--planning and action. It is my view that these functions will not be successfully performed in this region by volunteer, ad hoc committees of laymen. Some more permanent kind of organizational devices are needed, and we are fortunate in that we have them, at least in an embryonic form.

I refer to the town planning boards and the town Conservation Commissions. A substantial part of the towns in southern New England have legally constituted planning bodies and a growing number have conservation commissions. It is not too early to begin to think about the future role of these local bodies and to encourage them to broaden their scope of interests. Town planning boards should be encouraged to give as much attention to their open space problems as they now give to problems of their intensively used urban areas. Conservation commissions might well be the primary action devices for programs to maintain open space for strategically important uses and also to undertake some programs of Rural Renewal that are much needed.

### A PROPOSAL--"NEW PIONEER" COMMUNITIES

A number of areas in southern New England need programs of Rural Renewal. I refer specifically to farming areas. We are trying to maintain commercial agriculture here, in the face of competition from newer, more efficiently organized farming areas, but we are trying to do this within the framework of systems of land organization that were efficient 50 or 100 years ago, but are inefficient now. If the Commonwealth of Massachusetts wants a use for its "Agricultural Purposes Fund," let it be the basis for some imaginative pilot or "New Pioneer" projects in Rural Renewal.

The Soil Conservation Service in Massachusetts is working toward such an activity, and I would like to see the SCS engineers and agronomists, with the aid of some farm economists, make a complete replan of a few agricultural communities in these agricultural plans. They should obliterate farm and field boundaries, the road system, the farm buildings, and start from the beginning again. If we did organize the land resources of a few such communities to serve as the basis for the most efficient systems of farming possible, what would be the result in terms of productivity and income? I hazard a guess that we would find room for all those who want to farm, that the resulting farms would make a positive contribution to the region's economy, and in addition these areas would better stand the competitive pressure of urban demands for the land. I would like to see such planning efforts made for three or four towns in the region, and if the plans look feasible, I would like to see the necessary state and federal funds to transform these new pioneer communities--to build an efficient system of roads and other utilities, lay out farm and field boundaries where they should be in terms of modern farming needs, to provide drainage, stone removal, sub-soiling, or land leveling, build efficient farm structures, and organize efficient local marketing mechanisms.





This is, I believe, a task for a more broadly oriented Soil Conservation Service, assisted, in the development phase by the financing and farm advisory facilities of the Farmer's Home Administration. Each such project should be under the local control of an elected body of responsible people. I think the Town Conservation Commissions could be so used.

### SUMMARY

In summary, my recommendations for making Rural Areas Development work in southern New England are these:

1. Things not to do

- a. Don't organize RAD committees - work through existing bodies
- b. Don't prepare OEDP's - concentrate on critical resource use problems

2. Things to do

- a. Extension services start immediately on programs of public policy education relating to open space problems, and with each state director appointing a specialist in full-time charge of the project and putting in enough money to provide assistants, educational materials and the other necessary means to make a significant dent on ignorance.
- b. SCS - with the assistance of FHA and Extension, undertake comprehensive planning operations for three or four "New Pioneer" communities in cooperation with the local Conservation Commissions.
- c. The States and the Federal Government - begin to put together the necessary funds to carry out these demonstrations.





RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH RAD IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, MAINE

by  
Vernon McFadden, Chairman  
Recreation Subcommittee  
Washington County RAD Committee

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, Gentlemen.

We are appreciative of the opportunity of presenting to you some of the activities of the citizens of Washington County, Maine in promoting Recreational Development within the County.

Washington County people and their friends have been concerned about the economic problems of the area for some time. Various groups discussed these problems and suggested possible solutions. Recreational Development was one of the areas that seemed to offer the most opportunities.

The local Chamber of Commerces and the County Chamber of Commerce worked on several projects but these were only mildly successful, to say the least.

We were in about the same position as the controversy about the Little League Manager - A Little League pitcher had walked the first eight men at bat. The manager sent in a new pitcher -- out of the crowd stormed the lads mother -- "What do you mean taking him out of the game," she yelled. "You fool - he had a no-hitter going."

This was about the same position we were in until we changed pitchers. In 1956 the U. S. Department of Agriculture included Washington County in the Rural Development Program and we started getting a few men on bases. During 1961 the Rural Development Program was expanded and reorganized into the present RAD Program and we began to score a few runs.

Under the program we have the cooperation, advise, and experience of the many Federal and State agencies and I certainly would be remiss in my duties if I did not give credit to the U. S. Department of Agriculture and to the several State of Maine Departments for the help they have given all our committees. It certainly is refreshing in this day and age to meet and work with such dedicated men - and I say this with all sincerity.

With an organization and a source of professional help it was decided to take an inventory of assets of the county and we found that the tourist business was returning roughly more than 4 million dollars annually (estimate by DED) to the county and there were



limitless areas for expansion of recreation provided by nearly 1 1/2 million acres of woodland, 135,000 acres of lake area, over 400 miles of main rivers and large streams, an abundance of smaller streams and brooks, and hundreds of miles of fascinating coastline, bays, and inlets. I hope you will pardon this little plug for Washington County but as past president of the County Chamber of Commerce I have to tell you of our beautiful County.

The question was asked - how do we get the people of the county enthused and worked up over these possibilities. It was decided to make a 13-minute sound and color film depicting the county's attractions. This has served us a two-fold purpose. First, to awaken the residents of the county and start people talking; secondly to let the State and Country know we were on the move. The film is available from the State of Maine Extension Service and from the State of Maine Department of Economic Development. You will see this film later this evening.

As we became more involved in this recreation business we realized that we were mere babes in the woods as far as long-range planning was concerned. The Northeast Forest Experiment Station, U. S. Forest Service, was contacted and we were most fortunate in having Mr. Hubert Burke and Mr. Francis Rushmore assigned to Washington County. As a result of this assignment Mr. Burke and Mr. Rushmore published a report entitled "A Planning Guide for Outdoor Recreation in Washington County". This is a wonderful piece of professional work -- copies may be seen on the display rack.

We were concerned with the vanishing shoreline on both salt and fresh water frontage and felt areas should be opened to the public. We asked and received cooperation from Service Clubs, Granges, Sportsmen Clubs, town officials and some of the public in spreading the message of our program of a free public access to every lake and protected saltwater shoreline in the county. We were all crazy, numbskulls and a Moses trying to lead people to the Promised Land. I assure you we had no such ambition but we did perhaps emulate Joshua in that we blew down some of the walls of resistance. A two-fold objective has been accomplished in this area. First, the various towns and communities have, through their efforts, provided or will have provided by the end of 1964 public access to some 40 odd sites on fresh and salt water, thus bringing pleasure to many people and revenue to the local storekeepers, etc. Secondly, in opening access rights the local towns have benefited from additional taxes due to construction of summer camps and cottages on adjacent lands. I am thinking particularly of East Grand Lake where several miles of road was built to open the public site. Land was leased by pulp companies and there has been substantial construction of good quality summer homes.





Washington County woodlands are owned for the most part by large pulp companies of Maine and we wish to acknowledge and give credit to the part they have taken in this program. St. Regis, St. Croix (Georgia-Pacific), Dead River, have given land, leased land, loaned personnel and cooperated in so many ways in the development of the county. As progress was made we realized we must build for the future and start looking for some tangible legal body to tie to the work. The Rural Development Committee circulated a petition to the County Legislative Delegation, supported and carried out the idea by successfully introducing a bill in the Maine Legislature creating the Washington County Development Authority. This gives us legal authority to develop, construct, operate, and maintain recreational areas in Washington County.

I do not wish to convey the impression that RAD has solved all our problems - we have many serious and involved problems - but I must say that RAD has put life and power in our attack of these problems.

My advise to you people concerned with this work can be best explained with this little story. A man called on his dear friend - the friend was in prison, condemned to die in the electric chair the next morning - what would he say on leaving - he couldn't very well say "I'll be seeing you" so he shook hands and said "More Power to You."





ACTIVITIES OF TAP IN WASHINGTON COUNTY

by

Asa Mace

County Supervisor

Farmers Home Administration

I feel a little out of place following a man like Mr. McFadden, but you can easily see why he was elected President of the Washington County Chamber of Commerce.

We in Washington County have on our Technical Action Panel a team of young, eager and aggressive men who are dedicated to the task that has been handed to them, in helping people help themselves. They are:

Richard Varney - Extension Association  
Robert Fammons - Forest Service  
John Malley - Soil Conservation Service  
Brewer Andrews - Representing ASCS  
Keith Havey - Inland Fish and Game Department  
Robert Clark - from REA; the manager of a local coop in our area.

as well as myself from FHA.

We also have the cooperation from another dozen or so Federal, State and local groups who have been willing to give of their time and talents to get RAD working in Washington County.

I have been asked to enumerate on some of the work that this Technical Action Panel has been requested to help with or trying to develop.

First some of the work involved in getting the overall economic development plan submitted. This was a continuation of a committee formed in 1956 to carry on the Pilot Program. All members of the Technical Action Panel helped with various phases of the work.

The Rural Area Development Committee felt there was a need for a Water Resources Report for the county which can be used in many ways in planning for industry, recreation and fisheries. Mr. Havey and his staff have put a lot of time and effort into this report and will certainly be a very useful publication for planning.

Requests for approval of projects dealing with Water Resources have been received - \$38,000 for the like of East Machias Fishway which can be of tremendous importance as a source of revenue in the sale of elewives for that town.



Just recently the St. Croix project was approved. Designed by the department's Engineering Division, the fishways will be financed cooperatively from three sources. The U. S. Accelerated Public Works Program will pay \$195,000. St. Croix Paper Company, a subsidiary of Georgia-Pacific Corporation, has pledged \$75,000. The balance will be paid by the Fish and Game Department.

Many studies are now going on which will help in the future for a source of revenue and income of this area.

A Forestry survey was requested and \$15,000 ARA Grant for technical assistance was received, and we now have complete count of the different species of wood in the county. This will be used to attract new industry.

Also in recent months the biggest industry in the county - St. Croix - Georgia-Pacific has just authorized a 25 million dollar expansion for a Kraft Division.

Outdoor Recreation Survey - This committee has gone ahead with access sites and have developed a number of these within the county. The U.S.D.A. Forest Service has completed a survey to be used as a Guide in Planning Outdoor Recreation.

We have been requested to help with the expansion of local industry like new hardwood mill, cedar mill. Helping others obtain capital and reviewing potential of others.

We have a 13-minute film depicting the county's recreational resources and is now being distributed.

We have requested a Peat Bog Survey for Washington County. The SCS agreed to survey the bogs. They were surveyed for:

1. area - there are 1,000 acres
2. average depth
3. type of peat
4. availability of drainage

This we think has great potential. However, more mechanization will be needed.

John Sullivan 84, walked into my office the other morning, sat down and about 10 minutes explained he needed \$15,000 or \$20,000 to develop a peat bog he values at 1/4 of a million dollars. We haven't come up with the answer on this financial problem. However, we have assisted in getting one peat operation going with an ARA loan and SBA loan for about \$75,000.





60  
- 3 -

We have requested SCS to conduct a survey on minerals. Work on this survey could attract new industry.

One of the Federal Parks "The Moosehorn" has just spent \$365,000 on increase of its recreational facilities. This has been of great help in relieving the unemployment situation the past winter.

Getting these surveys, helping in every way possible, our local RAD committee on projects they think has a practical use in the county, meetings, discussions, tours, etc. have been part of the TAP work. Some of these projects and surveys have been very helpful to the local RAD Committee. However, some of these are left idle to collect dust.

FHA carried on its regular loaning program; of special help has been our Farm Housing Program and our Aid to the Elderly People. We have processed over 50 RH loans in the last six months.

SCS has conducted surveys, planning recreational projects. It is expected that they will do more in Resource Planning and recreation.

ASCS has been active in cost sharing programs in regards to recreation and land use.

Extension has had the task of working out the problems and requests with our full cooperation.

Forestry has been very helpful to farm wood lot owners and also to the Federal Park Service.

Inland Fish and Game has conducted surveys and is very helpful to other studies going on within the County.

REA has its own problems of late in they are expanding or trying to purchase or merge with another coop.

However, to conclude I would leave some thought concerning the TAP. I think consideration should be given to having these men who represent our straight-line agencies be a part of these RAD committees and we should hammer out these ideas and projects to a workable solution.

Some of these committees should be armed at once for action and Do It Now if it is worth while and be able to eliminate and cut out Red Tape.





61  
- 4 -

I think any group that has problems and that are meeting should have answers then, and not go through two or three agents, committees, and agencies before the word is passed out - Yes or No.

Let's also think about planning the Community Water System  
Vocational School  
Coop ventures  
Project of value to its citizens.

Let's keep the aggressive, young, educated people in our Rural Areas for a better tomorrow.



RAD IN WASHINGTON COUNTY

by

Richard Varney  
Extension Agent  
Washington County, Maine

A little background of the history and economic climate of Washington County, Maine might be helpful in your appraisal of what we have to present. Unfortunately, time does not permit me or my associates to give a thorough coverage of this subject or of the work which has been done under the RAD program.

Historically, Washington County's economy has been based upon seasonal industries, the principal ones being lumber and pulp, coastal fishing and blueberry production. Back in the 1800's lumbering was king and the population reached its height about 1900. Since that date, there has been a steady decline, with the exception of 2 or 3 towns.

Present population is about 30,000. From this, you can visualize our over-crowded condition. A land area of 2,600 square miles containing 30,000 people.

Sardine canning has been the mainstay in most of the coastal towns, along with lobster fishing. Although the lobster industry has remained relatively stable, the sardine industry has been in a decline for some time. This has created a serious economic and social condition.

There is much unemployment and underemployment and many people have been forced to leave the area. Our greatest loss are the young people. After finishing high school, many are leaving for better jobs and steady employment.

One cannot consider Washington County an agricultural county; however, there is a sizable blueberry growing and processing enterprise and the poultry industry now grosses about 1 1/4 million dollars annually. Dairying is limited to local markets. You are all aware of the dilemmas facing agriculture today. It, therefore, will not be necessary to attempt to cry on your shoulders with respect to our troubles in this field.

In 1956, application was made to the U.S.D.A. to include Washington County, Maine as one of the original 55 pilot counties in the earlier Rural Development Program. Approval was received in October, 1956.





- 2 -

Plans for the county development program were discussed at open meetings. Finally, a committee consisting of 100 members was organized and a chairman elected. A 10-member executive committee was then elected. It was this committee that assumed the task of plotting a course of action, by determining exact projects and immediate steps to be taken to develop and implement projects.

The overall committee was broken down into subcommittees to cover the following areas: Poultry, Blueberry, Forestry, Livestock, Education and the towns of Danforth and Machias.

During 1961 the original Rural Development Program was expanded and reorganized into the present Rural Areas Development Program at the national level. The various committees related to agriculture were consolidated into one Agricultural Committee; the Forestry Committee was left to function as in the past; and new committees were organized in the fields of Recreation, Marine Resources and Human Resource.

An Overall Economic Development Plan was prepared and submitted for approval in 1961. All projects proposed since that date have been based upon that OEDP.

The Executive Committee which had the responsibility of coordinating the plans of the sub-committees and to obtain the cooperation of other agencies, was faced with many obstacles.

Apathy on the part of the people of the county was and still is a big problem.

For reasons difficult to understand, there were many obstacles to overcome at the State level. It seemed to be an almost impossible situation to bring about a meeting of the minds of the State Extension personnel and State Departmental heads. And then when the Federal people were brought into the picture, the problems multiplied. That situation created untold confusion on the part of the local people and caused many unnecessary delays. The problems finally resolved themselves and the projects in question were completed. Completed several years late, but nevertheless, they were completed. These difficulties do not now exist as we are now receiving splendid cooperation from all agencies, local, state and federal.

I would, however, like to go on record to express the appreciation of the committee for the splendid cooperation received by the pulp and paper companies. As better than 50 per cent of the land of the county is owned by those companies, very little could be accomplished without their help.





Perhaps the greatest problem of our area is the economic revolution taking place in agriculture, the changes which have come about in the fishing industry, and lack of year round employment. In view of these conditions and the other rural problems which are common to all rural areas today, the OEDP needs to be revised and rewritten. It must be based upon present conditions and to the best of our ability, proposals and actions which will forestall a continuing eroding of our economic and social climate.

I might add that at the present time, a Smaller Communities Program is in operation to promote the economic adjustment of the individual residents. This is being done through the cooperation of ARA, the Maine Employment Security Commission, and the RAD Committee. The specific actions through which the overall objectives will be sought are to: (1) determine current and potential manpower resources of the area; (2) assist in evaluating the overall economic resources of the area; (3) assist in developing a program of economic development; and (4) provide employment counseling and placement assistance to individuals for jobs within or outside the area.



## FORESTRY IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, MAINE

by  
Robert L. Gammons  
Service Forester  
Maine Forest Service

Forests represent by far the most important land resource of Washington County. According to the recently completed Forest Inventory survey conducted by the U. S. Forest Service with an ARA Grant, there are 1,634,000 acres of land area in the County, 80 per cent of this or 1,300,000 acres is classified as commercial forest land, that is, land that is producing or capable of producing wood crops, economically available now or in the future and land not withdrawn from timber utilization through laws, such as might be found in a national park.

The forest survey split Washington County roughly into two equal Units, bisected by the so-called "Airline Road" which runs east and west from Bangor to Calais. These units differ in forest growth, type, stand and ownership characteristics but for the purpose of an overall view of the forest resources, I have for the most part grouped the figures. Industrial and private ownership comprises around 90 per cent of the commercial forest land - 750,000 A. are in company ownerships, 420,000 A. are in other private ownership.

Fifty per cent of the commercial forest land is in the spruce-fir type, 30 per cent is of the various hardwood types - typical beech, birch, maple of the Northern Hardwood Type and the pioneer types of aspen, white and gray birch, the remaining 20 per cent is White Pine-Red Pine type.

The forests of Washington County presently support an inventory of 15.5 cds/A. of softwood and hardwood growing stock timber 5"Dbh and up or 20 million cords - which in itself is a fairly respectable figure. However, when the figures are analyzed, we find that 45 per cent of the commercial forest land supports an inventory of less than 3 cords/A. of growing stock. The bulk of this acreage occurs in the Southern Unit of the county which averages an inventory of 11 cds./A. or 4.5 cds. below the County average. This indicates that much of the woodland in this Unit, which incidently has the highest percentage of private landownership's in the County, is poorly stocked or under stocked. As a forester this also shows in hard figures that this area needs some sound forest management on the land.

Sawtimber volume in the County totals 2.9 billion board feet or approximately 2,200 bd. ft./A. Almost two-thirds of this volume is located in the Northern part of the county on less than one-half the commercial forest area. Spruce-hemlock and pine make up 70 per cent of the volume and hardwood, principally Red Maple, comprise 20 per cent. Sawtimber volume in the southern unit averages 1,600 bd. ft./A.





The net annual growth of growing stock trees on all commercial forest land in the County is a little better than 1/2 cd/A., which is almost triple the amount of timber cut in 1962. This, however, doesn't give a true picture of the growth and drain. Only about 20 per cent of the annual growth of hardwood was harvested and this occurred mainly from hardwood pulp operated on private and company land in the Northern part of the county within trucking distance of a local kraft pulp mill. Annual growth on hardwood timber in the Southern Unit was some 60,000 cds. and although no cut and drain figures were developed for this unit, I would dare say that less than 5 per cent of this growth is being utilized due to the lack of markets for this type wood. Of the annual softwood volume growth, 40 per cent is being harvested. The forest industry of the county is largely a pulpwood economy - 65 per cent of the volume harvested in 1962 was pulp.

Annual sawtimber growth averages 68 bd. ft. per acre for the total county, as compared with 50 bd. ft./A. in the Southern Unit - a total of 89 million feet of sawtimber growth for the county, of which 15 million feet was hardwood. The sawtimber harvested is 63 per cent of the annual sawtimber growth. The survey indicated also that more than half the sawtimber volume cut was marketed as pulpwood.

Enough of the figures for now, as I think I have given you a fairly good idea of forest conditions in the county. A few general items influencing forest management should be brought out. Transportation facilities are good - truck hauling is the rule and there is a good system of public roads, in addition the paper companies own and maintain a complete improved road system. Rail facilities are adequate. Water transportation has been used in the past for driving pulp and logs to the mills, but the competition for bright paper and the companies need for fresh wood has caused the driving of pulp to cease here. St. Regis Paper Company still drives 5 million feet of pine and spruce logs on the Machias River each year, which incidently began yesterday in much the same manner as it did 100 years ago. Cutting practices generally vary with the owner, species and the type of operation. Diameter-limit cutting has been practiced for many years on the company lands - specification's called for fir 6"Dbh and over and spruce 8"Dbh and over to be harvested. However, some of the companies are getting away from this type of cutting and are starting to develop tree marking guides - one large paper company has been marking timber on their own land for several years now. Cutting practices on smaller ownerships leave something to be desired, although there has been considerable improvement.





The Rural Areas Development Program has functioned in Washington County for eight years. There have been several developments in the forestry phases directly and indirectly as the results of the RAD movement. Some have shown a tangible result, others although intangible offer tremendous potential.

The recently completed Forest Survey of Timber Resources of Washington County is the major accomplishment of the Forestry Subcommittee. If the county is going to develop and manage its forest resources, it must know what these resources are. This report will be of tremendous help. Already, four large paper companies have announced expansion plans and at least three of these companies will utilize and purchase quantities of wood which have been non-marketable and classified as weeds. Also, these companies will purchase this wood loaded on railroad cars in the Southern part of the county, thus eliminating costly trucking. This will mean heavier cutting but the end result should be better forest management and increased growth of higher quality material by taking some of the load off the spruce-fir inventory. Paper companies are requiring fresh wood so that these new markets will not only be beneficial to the rural landowner in stumpage returns on what was formerly non-marketable material, but will require year-round operation thus putting rural people to work on a more full-time basis.

The accelerated Public Works Recreational and Forestry Program these past two winters at the Moosehorn Wildlife Refuge have required thousands of man hours of local rural labor. Over 1,000 acres of immature forest area on the Refuge was thinned and weeded under their timber stand improvement project. This project was directed and supervised by the Service Forester of the Maine Forest Service and the Refuge Forester and provided fifteen men work through the winters.

Washington County is the birthplace of the balsam fir Christmas wreath business - the county produces about 60 per cent of the wreaths manufactured in Maine, some 300,000. Although this is a seasonal venture, it provides employment and income to many rural families. Some wreaths are made in the homes during spare hours and many other people produce wreaths at wreath factories. Typical of this family type operation is one of my co-operators in one of the coastal towns. From mid November through the Christmas season this co-operator produces balsam fir tips from his 60 A. woodlot for his wife who manufactures the wreaths in their home. He pitches in in the evening and together they produced 2,500 wreaths last fall which returned \$900 to this family. Many hundreds of other people produce the tips for the wreath factories - some consistently making \$100 each week. Within the last few years, two



new wreath plants, one firm from New York, and one from New Jersey, have located in the western part of the county. These two plants produce more than 100,000 balsam pieces - wreaths, roping, crosses - employing fifty people in the factory and countless others in the homes and supplying tips.

In recent years, a hardwood long lumber mill has located in Eastern Washington County and another hardwood mill has begun operating in Machias. These mills will go hand in hand with the new hardwood pulp market, utilizing the larger portions of the tree with tops going for pulp. If the ARA loan goes through on the Machias mill, it promises to be one of the largest furniture dimension and parts plant in New England with a production of six million feet of kiln dried, partially finished furniture components.

What about the forest management accomplishments in the woodlot - the Washington County Service Forester Project area is roughly located in the Southern Unit of the inventory survey. This unit contains 52 per cent of the commercial forest land in the county but only 38 per cent of the wood volume. Approximately 70 per cent of the land area is in private ownership consisting of a belt 20-30 miles deep extending in from coastline, with some smaller parcels scattered among the unorganized townships.

John Hinman, Chairman of the Board of the International Paper Company, once said that "Economics is the great forester" and this is certainly true in the Southern part of Washington County. This area is not a stronghold of good forestry due mainly to economic and market conditions. Many of the woodlots in this area have been cut very hard in the past, harvesting mainly the merchantable softwood species and leaving the unmarketable hardwood, tamarack and other species to take over the site or to suppress the tolerant softwood. Take for example the woodland owner or operator - inventory of 14 cds. of wood per acre -- say 7 cds. softwood and 7 cds. hardwood. Forest-wise it would be well to cut 5 cds. or 1/3 of this volume selectively removing mature wood of each type. However, the markets which might buy the hardwood are not within trucking distance and no rail wood will be purchased this winter. This operator has living expenses, taxes, kids to feed, cost of setting up the operation and roads - he can't dig clams or sand worms - or fish or guide sports - there's no industry hiring, no road construction. You know as well as I do how this woodlot is going to be operated.

Not all the woodlots have gone down this road and through an information and education program, the Service Forestry Program has been making some inroads in getting sound forest management on the





private woodlands in this Unit. Since the RAD Program began in 1955, management advice has been given by the various Service Foresters in this area to the owners of some 40,000 acres. This management assistance includes advice on the treatment of immature stands in the form of weedings and thinnings, insect and disease control information, harvest cutting on mature stands, tree planting and Christmas tree and wreath tipping cultural work. Eight hundred acres of idle and barren lands have been planted to almost one million tree seedlings. More than 5,300,000 bd. ft. of various wood products have been marked and harvested under the supervision of the Service Foresters on some 2,400 A., bringing a gross income to the landowner approaching \$100,000. Seven hundred fifty acres of immature stands have been thinned and weeded on a non-commercial basis to improve composition and growth rates. Christmas trees and wreath products harvested under improved management practices have grossed landowners another \$50,000.

The forest conditions and management problems in Washington County have been a long time in the making - they are not going to be solved over night. However, with the reality of new markets in the near future, the forest management climate is much improved - things are going to change, for the better forestrywise.





RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN MASSACHUSETTS

by

(William H. Coates)  
Assistant State Conservationist  
Soil Conservation Service

I should like to give a brief sketch of our situation here in Massachusetts as I think it is substantially different from most of Northern New England. Our situations may closely parallel those in Connecticut. Massachusetts is industrially oriented. This contrasts very sharply with areas where agriculture is the predominant or only industry. Here the dominant emphasis is on industrialization, with the vast problems associated with intense urbanization particularly in Worcester and Eastern to the Coast and in the Springfield area. The Cape and the Islands have very little agriculture and are highly recreation oriented.

Planning for future development and expansion has been relatively intense for some time over a large part of the State. This general process has been carried forward by individual towns and regional areas. The effort has been a joint activity of the principal officers of the political units of the State, as the Mayor and City Council of the cities, Selectmen of the towns, and has been supplemented in most instances by planning boards. Each town in Massachusetts generally has a rather closely knit body of people guiding town affairs. This group most often includes the Selectmen, the Planning Board, the Finance Committee, the Department of Public Works, the Water Department and generally a few special committees appointed to develop specific proposals.

More recently we have had Conservation Commissions enter the picture and they are advancing a general program for land acquisition for open space or other conservation developments of various kinds.

We have a widespread program of developing Master Plans for regions and for individual towns. This work is under the general direction of the Massachusetts Department of Commerce with Master Plans being developed by consulting firms. These projects are cost-shared by the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency. In developing these plans, cost-sharing has been done with various State departments, as in the recreational phases with the Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources or forestry phases with the Massachusetts Division of Forests and Parks. More recently soil surveys with urban and agricultural interpretations have been completed on a cost-sharing basis by the Soil Conservation Service. This latter information is being used by consultants developing Master Plans and by town planning boards.



In addition to the above we have activities on large development projects in harbor and seacoast improvements and flood control by the Corps of Engineers, the Public Law 566 program of the Soil Conservation Service with Conservation Districts and coastal programs on fisheries by the Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Massachusetts Department of Fisheries and Game. There also is an inland program on both fish and game, and forestry and recreation by the State agencies, often with Federal cooperation. Most of these activities are supported by both public and private organizations at the local level.

This is a resume of our situation, planning- and development-wise, here in Massachusetts. We know it is incomplete, but we have not intentionally omitted anyone from it. I am summarizing our situation very briefly to show its general intensity and to some degree the complexity of agency and inter-agency activities. In some instances it is difficult for the full-time professional worker to fully comprehend all that exists in each field of endeavor. To have the local people achieve full understanding is well nigh impossible.

With this large number of planning groups we have not tried to superimpose a whole new structure which might specifically be called RAD. We are continuously applying the RAD concept. This is people, elected officials or groups working together to foster their economic improvement. With State emphasis heavily on the urban and industrial side, the Rural Areas Development title does not fit too well. We do find the terminology "Resource Development" as particularly applicable. The nomenclature of the new program recently added to Soil Conservation Service responsibilities of Resource Conservation and Development also appears to be generally applicable as shown from some of our recent discussions in two of the counties in the State. We find that existing committees are generally adequate with only minor modifications needed to effectively deal with most local and regional resource development problems.

We have reported very little so-called RAD activity specifically designated as such. However, it should not be construed that we have not had very significant cooperative activity by all Federal, State, and local governmental units with local people to plan and implement toward a better life for our citizens. We have been forcefully trying to have agriculture occupy its just place in the committee decisions that affect future developments in the State. I think the following few illustrations will show some of the things that are being done at the State and local level.

The Extension Service has been given leadership in several noteworthy items:

1. In cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources, publication of "The Massachusetts Heritage," a Resource Development information piece for Conservation Commissions, Town Planning Boards, Selectmen and Legislators.





- 72
2. Active participation in the four Area Development Conferences sponsored by Governor Peabody and Senator Kennedy.
  3. Extension sponsored Governor's Conference on Land Use; also, the six meeting seminar "Resources, The Metropolis, and The Land-Grant University."
  4. In cooperation with the Berkshire County Industrial Development Commission, the College of Agriculture conducted three studies for expansion of forest based industries: (1) The Forest Resource, (2) Industrial Utilization, and (3) The Ownership Complex.

The program in Conservation Districts has been considerably broadened over the last few years to include work under the Small Watersheds Act (Public Law 566). Recent amendments to this Law have fostered more activity in the utilization of retention sites for multiple use, including recreation with allied fish and wildlife benefits. Resource development activities in watershed are good examples of RAD activity.

We have numerous examples of activity exemplifying the RAD concept in watershed work over the State. Three projects in Southern Berkshire County, including the Blackberry, the Clam and the Washington Mountain Brook watersheds, are in various stages of development. These projects have been sponsored by the Conservation District with support in planning and developing the projects from local watershed associations and other groups. The major Federal action has been by the Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service with such features as fish and wildlife and recreation being developed jointly with the Division of Fish and Game and the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service and recreation features by the Department of Natural Resources. Some of the Forest Service activities have been directly by the Federal agency and other phases cooperatively with the Division of Forests and Parks, The Massachusetts Water Resources Commission has taken an important part in both project development and in the application phases. Bills have been entered and passed in the State legislature for cost-sharing help on two of these projects to date. The ASCS and their committeemen locally have given consideration to helping with the accelerated land treatment program. Applications are either in or being considered for submission on 4 or 5 other watersheds in the county.

Berkshire County is well organized for planning and developing its natural resources. It has a county-wide Industrial Development Commission with three sub-area groups. The County-wide and the Northern Berkshire Development group has a full-time executive staff. OEDPs have been developed county-wide and for the Northern Berkshire area, using local or State funds and Federal grants.

In addition, a consulting firm is now preparing a report on recreational potentials in a series of towns in Northern Berkshire.





We have recently met with the Technical Agency Panel of the county and discussed the possible enlargement of the Panel to include additional agencies and have discussed the position of agriculture in resource development with the executive head of the Berkshire Development Association. It is recognized that a broad approach to resource development is needed and that industrial development is but one phase of the total job.

In Berkshire County, major employment has been in Pittsfield and the Adams and North Adams area. In Pittsfield the General Electric Corporation employs about 10,000 people. This is one of the larger single industry employment centers in the United States. The City of North Adams and its surrounding towns has been a so-called ARA underemployed area for some time.

Here we have a situation where industrial expansion is not nearly as rapid as in Eastern Massachusetts but where local changes or drops in employment can have an exceptionally severe impact. The other large employment centers are beyond general commuting distance of the major population centers in Berkshire County. An intensive program to provide additional recreational enterprises and related jobs may well be a most significant key to continued prosperity in the county.

This county is one of the most scenic in the United States. A large part of the county is farmed and a very desirable pattern of open countryside and forest makes this area a mecca for tourists. Efforts are being directed toward increasing the winter potentials to have a higher year-round tourist business. Statements from local officials and our preliminary look-see show definite needs for more recreational water and for attention to the full utilization of the forest potential.

We look forward to a continued and even much higher level of activity by the TAP and other agencies, State, Federal and local, in assessing and developing water resources. This seems to be a number-one priority. As we understand, an assessment of the ground water potentials is now underway by the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, the Water Resources Commission of the State and the Berkshire Industrial Commission. Strong interest is developing in expanding the watershed program in the northern part of the county to reduce flood damages and to greatly increase the amount of water area for recreational uses. The local forces are well organized and able to move forward to implement existing OEDPs, to supplement them as needed and to request a Resource Conservation and Development project.

The Quaboag Watershed in the southern part of Worcester County is another good example of cooperative activity by local, State and Federal people. The Conservation District sponsored the watershed. The local watershed association was composed of officials selected by each town to represent them along with representatives of all major industries. The educational phases and help at meetings was carried by the Extension Service. This project has moved into the construction stage with additions to the basic plan now being considered to take advantage of the new amendments to Public Law 566.





There is an application for a 566 project on the Ipswich River in Essex County. This is a large and complex area involving 10 to 15 towns. It lies on the northern fringe of the Boston complex wherein competition for land resources for highways, industry and urban expansion are intense. The need for additional industrial, municipal and recreational and wildlife water is very great. We expect that a watershed work plan will be developed to fit local needs through the combined efforts of the local people through their administrative units and with help from State and Federal agencies.

We are now just beginning to explore the possibilities for giving help in providing alternatives for resource development dealing with land and water directly with individual towns. We have three pilot towns so-called under consideration at the present time. In this effort we hope through an educational program and the joint efforts of agencies to make a greater contribution to land and water resource development. Our program of soil survey interpretations for towns and regions in Massachusetts is already scheduled into 1966. Demand for these interpretations is exceptionally high.

You will note from these examples that problems, or whatever you wish to call them, have been presented by local people, by local town officials or by development groups closely associated with the local people. It is obvious here, as it is most everywhere, that local people have a strong tendency to devote their major effort to a minimum of one or two major problems at a time. In developing both short-term and long-range objectives, most problems tend to infringe and blend with others. As this happens, the range of local governments, as towns, affected is generally broadened. You will note that we have adjusted our approach to asking that the local people be properly and fairly represented; that those agencies having an interest and being able to make a contribution be given an opportunity to participate in accordance with their prerogatives and resources; and that the administrative structure be as small or as broad as needed to bring the project objectives to fruition. We think this exemplifies the best concepts of RAD activity.

We recognize that we do not have all the answers to the resource development questions being asked of us. This has been emphasized in previous papers here at this conference. We probably never will have all the answers. We do find that most of the basic technical data about soil and water that we have been using in agriculture is directly applicable to resource development situations in communities. Interpretations are needed and we are moving forward to make them available.





X RURAL AREA DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTHEAST KINGDOM [ ] X

Roger Whitcomb, County Extension Agent, and  
Carl Gordon, Executive Secretary of Northeastern  
Vermont Development Association

The Northeast Kingdom consists of Caledonia, Essex and Orleans Counties in northeastern Vermont. It is bounded on the east by the Connecticut River and the State of New Hampshire, on the north by the Province of Quebec, Canada, and on the west by the Green Mountains. Only in its southern border does it have direct and easy access with the rest of the state. We mention this to point out that it is an area somewhat isolated geographically from the rest of Vermont. There are forty-nine towns in the area.

The topography of the area is rolling with some quite hilly sections. About 75% of the land area is in woodland. The climate of the area and the soils of the open land are excellent for production of grass and small grains. Because of these and other factors, dairying is the major agricultural enterprise. Approximately 85% of the area's agricultural income is derived from the dairy industry.

There are approximately 49,000 people living in the area. This is about twenty-five people per square mile. The average education level of the people in the area is a bit lower than the average for the state. Also the average income is lower than for most of Vermont. From 20% to 30% of the families have annual incomes of less than \$3000.00.

Obviously this is not a heavily industrialized area, but there are many small industries with woodworking the major industrial enterprise. Production of furniture and plywood are the major woodworking industries.

There are small granite industries and the major U. S. asbestos mine is located in the area.

The recreation industry potential is great in the Northeast Kingdom. There are innumerable lakes and streams providing camping, boating and fishing, mountains for skiing and hiking, and a good environment for wildlife providing good hunting. With superhighways extending south from the Montreal area and north from the eastern seaboard, the Northeast Kingdom lies in the path of traffic flowing north and south. Non-resident ownership of property has doubled in the past ten years. It would appear that the Northeast Kingdom is on the threshold of a major recreational development.

The Northeastern Vermont Development Association was established some fifteen years ago. This organization was one of five geographical areas designated by the State at that time in a move to organize a grass-roots approach to development. With the abandonment of the program at the State level all of the organizations but NVDA were disbanded.



We believe the reason NVDA continued was because we had a man who was editor of a local daily paper who had the foresight to realize that the regional approach to development would in time be recognized as the practical approach. In the early years the organization faltered on occasion. However each time it faltered, it was able to make a come-back which gave it new strength in the State as an organization of merit and in the area with an increased number of strong supporters.

The organizational set-up of NVDA is simple but effective. Four directors are elected from each of the three counties served by the NVDA. In addition there is the privilege of electing four directors-at-large. The purpose of these four directors is to give at any time voting power and authority to persons with special talents or knowledge to meet specific needs of any anticipated program.

To complete full representation of all areas and people of the Northeast Kingdom we have a town councilman in each of the forty-nine towns of the Northeast Kingdom. The function of these councilmen is to keep NVDA informed on the local needs and to relay to the people of their towns the various programs of NVDA.

As of this time we consider that we have 300 additional members of the basic organization. These 300 are the people who actively participated in the preparation of our Overall Economic Development Program. These people we consider as most valuable additions to our group. In the process of satisfying one specific need they came to realize the full potential of an area organization and what is equally important they became fully aware of how to utilize it.

Of course it costs money to operate an organization such as NVDA. We maintain offices in Lyndonville, Vermont. We have those general operating expenses incurred by any active group. We have the salary of an executive secretary and the salary of one full time secretary.

To obtain funds for the operation of NVDA a three-phase program was adopted. First we obtained through Legislature action permission to use Town appropriations to support our activities. Each year we ask each of our forty-nine towns to appropriate 2% of their Grand List to NVDA. Financial support from this source has increased steadily over the years. This past year all but two of the Northeast Kingdom towns approved appropriations for NVDA. Through this portion of the financial program we realize approximately \$10,000.00.

The second phase of the financing program is that of membership. We solicit business and individual membership. The suggested business membership rate is based on the number of employees of an establishment. We said suggested because we do not hold to the line in business and professional memberships. We use this merely as a guide for those people solicited. We have found that most people prefer to judge their own capability as far as support of NVDA. We have also found that the majority are quite willing to accept our suggested membership and in some cases prefer to give more than the suggested amount. A study of those who contribute less than the amount suggested has shown that usually it is for one of two reasons. The



first reason is that the particular business cannot afford more. The second is that the owner of the business does not fully realize the merit of an area organization. Fortunately as time goes by there are less and less of both of these categories.

An interesting aspect of this is that once one of these people who either cannot afford full membership or who do not see the merits in full support are converted they become not only the most generous at membership solicitation time but also the strongest supporters of our program throughout the year.

We also have had a most encouraging experience with individual memberships. This was an extremely important part of the fund program in the early days of the organization. However as time passed, it appeared that solicitation costs and handling costs were increasing to the point where it was questionable as to how practical the individual membership was. For this reason it was decided that we should abandon this form of fund raising. The first year that we did this income from individual membership dropped but not to any great degree. Those who had been faithful continued to be. Since we had no such thing as an individual membership these people made contributions.

As time went on, we received complaints from individuals. They had enjoyed being a part of NVDA, and they wanted to continue to feel that they were a real part of the organization. For this reason we have re-established the individual membership. This is not an important part of our income, but it certainly is an invaluable aid to program support.

The funds raised in the programs we have briefly covered totaled about \$15,000.00 per year. It would be misleading to call this our budget. It certainly would be confusing if you were to read some of our financial statements if we did not go on to further explain our program. One year which comes to mind our total income was \$9,000.00. During that year we paid \$2,000.00 in past indebtedness and then went on to sponsor a \$12,000.00 promotion in the Boston Herald. Yet we ended the year in the black.

The secret to our success is not a unique system of bookkeeping but real support for those special programs which have merit. In the case of the Boston Herald promotion individual business and commercial establishments plus Chambers of Commerce and similar organizations actually provided the cost of the promotional program. NVDA made its contribution by organizing the program, compiling the information, and doing the layout work. It also provided the vehicle and the materials for the follow-up program.

This is merely one instance. At various times either funds or materials have been contributed by people in the area to assure the success of other programs carried out by NVDA.

Now we have the organization and the dollars to operate the organization. To complete the explanation of our regional development group we will briefly explain the purpose as defined in our constitution and by-laws. Actually we believe the purpose as defined



is a brilliant approach to an area development program designed to span a limitless period of years. As long as there is no profit to inure to the benefit of any member or individual of the organization any thing which is legal can be a part of our program.

The purpose very simply is to develop and promote through study, planning, and publicity, the recreational, agricultural, industrial, natural and human resources of the area and to work for the economic and social betterment of the three counties.

The RAD program in the Northeast Kingdom was organized as follows. First, the directors of NVDA decided to have an economic study of the area made by someone. They felt that a better study could be made by local people through the RAD program than by hired consultants. An area RAD committee consisting of the NVDA directors was organized. This committee contacted the selectmen of each town, explained the RAD program to them and asked that they appoint one person to serve on a County RAD Committee. This was done. The County RAD Committees elected a chairman who also served on the area RAD Committee. The County RAD Committees set up the following subject matter study committees: land use, education, recreation, industry, transportation, utilities, finance and public buildings. These committees inventoried their respective areas, analyzed the situation and made recommendations for action in the various areas. From the work done by all of these groups an OEDP was prepared.

We have been asked to outline the activities undertaken by our organization as the result of the RAD program. We did not realize until we tried to define the specific programs how complete the marriage of NVDA and RAD actually was. This to us indicates the success of RAD in our area. It is seldom that two programs can be united without significant problems. At this time we cannot relate one problem encountered in using the combination of NVDA and RAD for the betterment of the entire three county region and ultimately the State of Vermont.

We think we in the Northeast Kingdom had a unique situation at the outset of our combining efforts with RAD. There is only one explanation which will suffice and for this reason we will give you a brief summary of the events leading to our cooperative venture with RAD.

The directors of NVDA voted some time ago to sponsor a regional planning program. To do this effectively and with the authority we felt necessary we placed an article in the warning of the Annual Town Meeting in each of our forty-nine towns. Prior to the meetings we used every media to explain what we were asking for and why we felt the program would be beneficial to our area. The response was nearly unanimously in favor of the planning program. However naturally time has passed since we had originally conceived the idea of a Regional Planning Program.

We at first had considered three methods of accomplishing a comprehensive plan. One of course was to have professionals do the job on a contract basis. The second approach was to hire professionals for specific areas of work with local people doing the balance.



The third was to have our own people complete the entire project. The decision as to which approach to take however never had to be made. By the time we were ready to embark on the project we had been designated as a 5b area under the Area Redevelopment Administration program which prescribes the approach for the Overall Economic Development Plan.

This however was entirely exploited in the many public meetings and discussions in the press and over the radio prior to our being designated as an ARA area. Vermont was taking a strong stand on the ARA program. Rather than to utilize the program it had merely decided more benefits could be derived by being the only state in the union not to be participating in the ARA program. The Northeast Kingdom however was taking a stand of its own. It did qualify as a 5b area and was determined to do so, and did after a rather stormy period of presenting its own stand.

At this time we started preparing our Overall Economic Development Plan under the RAD program. Areas of this activity were defined as NVDA and RAD in the early stages. This soon disappeared and since that time progress has been made by a total effort and we cannot define who actually did what or who was making the rules. We are very certain NVDA has gained much from its association with RAD and we sincerely hope the reverse is true.

To approach the subject given us, "what has my organization accomplished by its association with RAD", we will outline some of the programs we have carried out in the Northeast Kingdom since the union of the two groups in a total effort. Again we cannot define precisely how each project came into being nor can we precisely say what part either NVDA or RAD played.

During the preparation of our OEDP we sponsored an ARA program for a plywood firm expansion project. We helped to prepare certain areas of the application by supplying information gathered by our planning group. We also raised the required 10% in local money which in this case amounted to \$30,000.00. This project was approved and we realized the full benefit of the expansion. However ARA funds were never called for because of changes in the organization just prior to the start of the expansion program.

Our next ARA program was one that required approximately \$15,000.00. Again we had no trouble in assisting with the project and raising the required amount. This project created, or will at its completion, create some seventy-five jobs. This project has also created a climate which has brought the interest of a Canadian firm which is now taking the preliminary steps to establish a second plastics industry in the area. Either firm will gain from the presence of the other.

In one community of 300 people we had a fund drive to raise the local participation money for an ARA project. In less than two weeks time these people accumulated \$6,000.00 within their own community. This made possible the establishment of a new industry in a town which has been completely void of industry for approximately



thirty years. The attitude of the people in this particular case was an important factor in the settling of a second industry, which has tremendous growth potential, in this community.

Faced with the loss of the largest industry in one of the largest communities of the Northeast Kingdom the people, again in less than two weeks carried out a \$500,000 fund campaign. This campaign was over subscribed by \$35,000.00. The action of the community here saved 500 jobs and established a new attitude in the community. Since this drive the people have taken an entirely new approach to development in their community. This approach will we are quite certain at this time bring a new industry to the community which will employ ultimately 400 people with a very nice wage level.

The most recent fund drive in the area was for the purpose of accumulating \$80,000.00 in local funds for a large woodworking firm now applying for ARA financing. The \$80,000.00 was obtained in one week with pledges which will make the total development fund a little over \$100,000.00. The additional funds will be used to share local costs for a second industry which is locating mid-way of two communities.

Again here is a complete reverse of community attitude. An attitude which to a great extent is the result of communities working together in a RAD effort. It was but a few years ago that these communities were vying for a Canadian concern which had indicated an interest in putting a branch operation in the Northeast Kingdom. During this period every cut-throat method was used to lure the industry. Community leaders openly attacked each other. These same leaders today are displaying an eagerness to work together.

Fund drives are also being carried on at this time to provide two area private schools with more adequate and desirable facilities. The combined effort amounts to approximately 3 million dollars.

Community schools for retarded children and the handicapped are also a part of the effort to make the Northeast Kingdom a better place to live. No end of community and area projects which were first suggested in the OEDP are now being planned or carried out.

Again we would like to say that it is impossible for us to say this effort is the result of NVDA or that one is the result of the RAD program. We think the real factor is that RAD in our area is a program flexible enough to compliment any area activity. Our only comment on the RAD program is that when we think of RAD in our area we think of a working program of great merit.

All has not been good. Many people in this room have undoubtedly at times been very concerned about the attitude of ourselves and NVDA on occasion, however when we have found areas of difficulty in the RAD program we have quickly let it be known. In every case the response has been one which allowed differences in approach to be quickly settled to the satisfaction of all concerned. RAD in our area is highly successful, and we feel that it will continue to be for some time to come.



RESEARCH AND THE HUMAN FACTOR IN RAD

We're talking about Rural Areas Development during these two days--about the economic progress of rural America. We're discussing the ways that our various agencies can better work together to turn the full force of our scientific and technical specialties toward one great united effort. The goal--to help our fellow citizens improve living conditions in rural areas and eventually abolish poverty from our countryside.

You will note that I have listed the abolition of poverty as one of the goals of Rural Areas Development. This is not a new goal born in the spotlight of the current publicity on poverty but one which has from the beginning characterized RAD. By increasing economic opportunities in rural America, we are combating poverty. For this reason I shall refer to our opportunities to combat poverty - not through a separate and distinct program - but through our ongoing Rural Areas Development Programs.

If the technological sciences alone could have accomplished the job of rural areas development, we would not be meeting here today. For in agricultural science, this country has no equal in the world. We're out-producing every other nation, enjoying the greatest abundance of food and fiber per capita ever known to man. You know the statistics well.

Why then is there unemployment, under-employment and rural poverty today in the midst of all this abundance? Some answers are obvious--the very efficiency of the American farmer has released many workers into a labor force already overcrowded with the unskilled. People must migrate. Local economy suffers. Yet the natural resources are there, in almost every locality. Scientists already know how to make the best use of them. What is the missing link?

I submit that depressed areas still exist because we do not yet know enough about the most important resource of all--the human resource and we don't know how to motivate people to more effectively use the natural resources around them. Rural Areas Development can work only through people. Each agency represented here today depends on the understanding of the people it works with to get any job done effeciently, and in the great united effort that is RAD, this need for mutual understanding is infinitely multiplied.

---

Talk given by N. C. Brady, Director of Science & Education, USDA, at a series of regional Rural Areas Development conferences April 14 through May 8, 1964.

Our major task then is twofold: (1) By research and study to learn more about the people and their problems in rural areas and, (2) by education to motivate these people to use their resources to help themselves. In both cases, we need tools to accomplish our objectives. These tools may be brain power, organizational ability, financial support or technical guidance.

In research, the unknown variables of working with people as groups and individuals now demand our study as insistently as technical problems ever did. Certainly, we shall continue technical research--the need for technological advancement in agriculture will never cease. But now I believe we must also intensify formal research into the methods of working with people and especially those who do not have the advantages of economic security possessed by most Americans.

In some ways, this may be the hardest job agricultural agencies have ever tackled, since causes and effects in human activities are never clear-cut. But we need to, and must, find out more about human behavior, motivations, and learning patterns, if we are to help the people who request our services.

May I cite a few examples to illustrate our need for research on people. We know that 4-H clubs are generally not as effective among low income families as they are among the middle and upper income groups. But do we know why? We know local home bureaus exert much of their influence among the middle classes. Effective programs among the economically needy are not as common as we would like them to be. Do we know the reasons for this? Are the underprivileged motivated by the same stimuli as the economically independent? Is our failure to accomplish more with the disadvantaged due to our lack of effective contact or communications with them or to their failure to react to our efforts? I don't think we know the answers to these questions and until we do it is almost certain our RAD programs will not fully succeed.

We may have to revise some of our old ideas--fondly cherished notions that have guided our operations through the years, as we dig deeper beneath the surface of the behavioral sciences--as we try to approach the depth in knowledge of human beings that we have plumbed so well in the technical sciences.

Research and education I believe, are the keys to opening the door for rural development. Through these we can find better ways to share information, provide hope, and encourage enough self-confidence to help people act individually and collectively to solve their economic problems.

Research can tell us a great deal about how people feel--what they are really concerned about--as a basis for planning and implementing a RAD program. Education can give them the know-how to get the job done.



Since my remarks are to be focused on research and education, one might assume that they are addressed only to the research and extension agencies represented here, the Land Grant Colleges, and the department research agencies. May I stress that this is not the case. I submit that if any permanent good is to come from the program of any agency represented here today, it will be through research and education - perhaps not through formal research or education in the traditional sense, but through changes in attitude and outlook, improvements in skills and abilities, and through motivation for self-improvement. The changes will come only through the learning process aided by experimentation with new techniques to make that learning process more effective.

In developing a sound RAD program in a county, a region, or a state, consideration must be given to at least the following factors:

(1) The specific group of people whose economic status we are trying to improve - their economic, social, educational and physical characteristics and potentials.

(2) The total resources, human and natural, which can be mobilized in the area to help people help themselves. (The human resources will include some in addition to those referred to in (1) but will not exclude them.)

(3) The organizational and institutional structures needed to do the job, giving first attention to involvement of the people in the area.

(4) The technical and educational assistance available to the people and their organizations to plan and expedite a RAD program for their area.

May I comment briefly on the first and third of these four considerations and the place of research and education in dealing with them.

#### Low Income Families and RAD

First, let us characterize the people whose economic status we are trying to improve -- the low income families who are at the core of the need for rural areas development. They are the ultimate, human reason for the very existence of the RAD movement.

Low income families have a general lack of skills, education, special training, and leadership ability -- in other words, their human resources are undeveloped. Their poverty results in inadequate schools, poor roads, erosion of social and community life, and economic retardation. Their low income tends to depress income levels in other parts of our economy. So they are of concern to all Americans.

Too many families in rural areas are experiencing uncertain employment, substandard health and education, and generally low income and living standards. They are confronted with the complexities of the modern world,

but, many still are psychologically and emotionally adjusted to an out-  
moded pattern of living. And, unfortunately, many of these families are  
apathetic about their situation and often suspicious of outside assistance.

Self-generated interest in cooperation with others to improve their lot is not likely to come from people who do not aspire to change. They may feel hopelessly committed to their present social and economic standards of living. They need motivation and we must help them develop it. Though we regard Rural Areas Development as a grassroots movement--and not a government program--we can and must help people recognize their problems and take action to solve them.

Research conducted so far with low-income groups has hinted at basic differences in motivation that we must understand in order to help them. Usually these people do not wish to put off immediate satisfactions for the sake of long-term goals--and RAD in many areas is a fairly long-term program. Smaller, step-by-step projects can be planned as part of the larger goal, to keep these people interested through achievement of small but important successes along the way. Here again, more research is needed to guide us in helping RAD leaders plan with people.

We've scarcely scratched the surface in understanding the motivations of low-income groups, in learning what basic needs have to be satisfied before they will be receptive to the idea of area development. Their values and attitudes must be better understood in order to work with them sympathetically.

I must not give the impression that educational and action programs are to wait until research provides all the answers as to how to work with low-income people. Sometimes I think we know more now than we are using. We know, for example, that our conventional means of communication with low income families are not too effective in motivating them to improve themselves. We know that our traditional pattern of working primarily with those who ask for our help or who volunteer for membership in our organizations does not generally result in our reaching the really poor and disadvantaged. Obviously, we need educational programs which try new means of communication which use new and different educational techniques and which can be tried out "on the firing line," not just in the laboratory or office.

#### Some RAD Research Completed

Several Land-Grant universities and government agencies have already completed valuable research projects that are now guiding the direction of rural development projects.

The Agricultural Research Service as early as 1959 made studies of low-income families and their resources in order to set up guidelines for rural development leaders.



In several states meaningful sociological and economic studies related to rural development have been made, probing the underlying attitudes and values held by local people. A Van Buren County, Arkansas, study for instance, supplied worthwhile guidelines on people's attitudes on education, migration, and off-farm jobs.

In Kansas, sociologists, economists, and political scientists pooled their talents to show that political boundaries have little meaning in rural areas development--area development cannot stop at county or even state lines.

A research team in Louisiana studied the reason why industries locate where they do. They found that local inducements such as supplying plant buildings to lure industry were less important factors than human variables.

Pennsylvania State studied both attitudes of people toward their community and how extension agents feel about rural development, with useful findings.

Michigan looked into the orientation of people in one area, to find out the geographical limits of the region they identified themselves with. This kind of information would be most important to know before region RAD programs are set up.

Iowa has used sociological research procedures to identify leaders for RAD.

Each USDA State and local agency could use more research data to tell how well our own State and county staff workers understand the RAD movement. The Extension Service for example, last year surveyed West Virginia field personnel to learn their attitudes, opinions, and degree of understanding of RAD. Extension gleaned some solid facts on which future personnel training could be based.

#### Some Fields for Further Research

In spite of the progress that has been made in research and experimentation to improve RAD there is yet much need for improvement and expansion. For example, within each state we need an ORED a kind of "Overall Research and Education Development Plan" to help administrators and scientists review current research and education programs in relation to the resource development needs of the entire state. This kind of broad evaluation would lead to consideration of problems community by community and region by region.

It would also provide a means of focusing attention on specific questions such as the following:

1. How can low-income people be motivated to develop their potential to help themselves? To what extent can leadership within this group be developed and used?



2. What means of communications are best in reaching the people most concerned with RAD?
3. What types of development organizations work best with these people? Can the rural organizations which have served commercial agriculture so well do comparable jobs with those less fortunate economically? Do we need different organizations for low income families or can they be served by those we now have?
4. Are RAD groups more effective when organized from the area level downward or from the county or community level up?
5. What are the most feasible boundaries for a development area? Are they best set by geographic, economic or social means? Or are they set largely in minds of people and in their concepts of their place in society?
6. What are the aspirations of low-income people? How can these associations be changed and how can they be understood by the RAD leadership?
7. How can we get local groups to effectively communicate their needs and accomplishments to area, state, and national groups?
8. What kinds of training are needed for RAD research and education personnel and for the local leadership?
9. How can we work most effectively with urban community organizations so that we complement them rather than compete with them?

May I also mention a kind of research or self-evaluation that in some instances may be appropriate to improve our RAD program? How well do RAD workers themselves understand the RAD concept and the potential it has for alleviating poverty? Are we getting and giving maximum cooperation with each other as we carry out our part of an overall RAD program. It is just possible that even we need self-evaluation to determine means of getting the most from our joint efforts.

Work with low income people may have been delayed in some cases by a fear that on-going programs would suffer in the competition for funds and personnel. I personally do not think this will happen if we develop and coordinate research and educational programs aimed specifically at helping low income families. We often have used a shotgun rather than a rifle approach in attacking this problem.

#### Importance of Local Orientation

The strength of RAD as well as that of the several governmental agencies that contribute to it is in its orientation to local needs and response to

local people. President Johnson in a recent anti-poverty message to Congress emphasized this point when he said:

"These are not plans prepared in Washington and imposed upon hundreds of different situations.

"They are based on the fact that local citizens best understand their own problems, and know best how to deal with those problems.

"These plans will be local plans striking at the many unfilled needs which underlie poverty in each community, not just one or two. Their components and emphasis will differ as needs differ."

Today more than 75,000 people are involved in rural development activities at the county level, another 5,000 are taking part in multi-county area organizations for resource development, and many more in community programs.

Two thousand state RAD committeemen guide the policies of development in 45 states. What do we know about even these chosen leaders and the way they think? About their special needs? One thing we do know is that their ideas and needs are likely to vary as much as the regions they represent.

This human resource--all 80,000 of them--presents a vast cross-section of Americans--cooperative, independent; opinionated, open-minded; aggressive, hesitant; practical, daydreaming; educated, less educated; leaders, followers--united by one big engrossing idea: working to develop their home territory for a better living. To help these thousands, and the thousands more who will be coming into and planning RAD programs in the future, we need to know more about what they want, what they need, and what they are capable of handling.

### The Advantages of Cooperation

The rural areas development program provides an opportunity for USDA agencies and universities to cooperatively utilize the basic principles of long-range planning and program projection. No one agency can cover all the needs, provide all the knowledge for development. That's why we have a cross-section of talents on Technical Action Panels. No one agency can carry out all-encompassing research project of the scope needed for development today. Inter-agency cooperative research projects can do the job.

Many of the problems of total economic development lie somewhat outside the traditional fields of agriculture. We may find subjects like industrial development, tourism, local government and finances, urban sprawl, etc., unfamiliar. It will broaden our outlook to learn more about these fields.

RAD call for a high degree of cooperation with groups such as chambers of commerce, planning commissions, health and welfare agencies, labor unions and industrial groups.



You'll discover other talented people.

Women, for instance, are important in RAD! And if it's true that "the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world," then certainly the women can be a powerful and energetic force working for economic and social development. It will be to the advantage of each agency to have community women leaders informed about the kinds of work it performs.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

A good start in evaluating resources has been made in more than a third of the counties of the Nation through the preparation of written OEDP's. Organizational and educational work is started in another third. Many RAD committees have selected priority projects and are working on developing them. This process--appraising human and other resources, identifying opportunities, acquiring knowledge, and taking action, needs to continue.

When the pace of social and economic change was slower, there was more time for adjustment to new technology than there is today or will be in the future. There is no time now for delay. New knowledge is available, and we must find newer, faster ways of conveying it to our citizens. Only informed citizens, who know where they want to go and understand how to get there, can reduce the time lag between economic change and necessary adjustments. Research and education are our tools to get this job done.

We must pool our talents for training as well--training of our own people, and of RAD committees where they say they want it. If RAD is to bring about a higher degree of rural development, our agency personnel and rural leaders must mutually understand the job to be done.

The civilized world is watching what we are trying to do here. If we can develop our own depressed areas, we can claim leadership in teaching others. Our trained RAD people will become as valuable an export item as anything in our foreign aid programs.

The RAD method builds a solid foundation for healthy economic development, and for an attack on rural poverty. I am convinced it will have far-reaching effects toward a better life for millions of Americans yet to be born.

Working alone, we could do much, but united into a smoothly operating, coordinated effort, the special talents and strengths of our organizations will make an unbeatable team.



REPORT OF GROUP I

New England Regional RAD Conference

Subject: Effective Organizational Structures for RAD  
(Committees and alternative types of organization)

Chairman: Lemuel Peet

Secretary: Frank D. Pollard

During the course of the discussion which took place in Group I, four specific problems were identified that related directly to RAD organizational activity. There was discussion of a fifth problem not directly associated with organizational structures, but which was considered to be pertinent to the operation of committees or other types of organizations which were established.

Problem 1:

There is a need to maintain considerable flexibility in the organizational structures concerned with RAD.

It was recognized that a great deal of flexibility was now permitted, but there seemed to be a fear of drifting toward more rigidity than could be tolerated.

More specifically, this had reference to the need for using existing organizational structures, where appropriate, and to the matter of allowing latitude with respect to the jurisdictional areas to be served by them or by any new groups to be established.

It was recognized that a county might be the most logical area to be served by a committee, but that latitude should be allowed for establishing multi-county groups such as the Northeast Kingdom of Vermont. Similarly, it was felt that committees might be established to serve less than a county. At the same time it was mentioned that Aroostook County, Maine, although an area which might tend to prefer more than one committee because of its size, actually had only one committee and apparently an effective one.

Surprisingly, there was very little discussion about use of the word "rural" in identifying the various development groups serving the New England area. Here again, though, it seemed to be the consensus that a great deal of flexibility should be allowed. At the same time it was pointed out that the use of some other nomenclature could be equally as misleading and tend to narrow the scope of a group's activity. For example, use of the term "Resource Development Committee" might tend to place too much emphasis upon the development of physical resources without adequate consideration being given to the development of human resources.

In conclusion, it was agreed that the name attached to a development group was not the important consideration, but rather the purpose it served.



Problem 2:

There is a need for organizing or strengthening existing development committees or groups so that they will be truly representative of the many segments of community life. Associated with this was recognition of the need for identifying and getting on the committees people having a genuine interest in the problems of their respective areas and with sufficient time to devote to activities of the group.

It was suggested that more attention be given to the identification of community leaders and that greater consideration be given to the use of women as members of development groups. It was generally agreed that women would be more concerned and have a more sympathetic attitude toward the problems of people. This was considered to be particularly important in view of the prospects for passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

To further strengthen existing organizations, it was agreed that some method should be devised by each group to weed out members who were inactive or demonstrated a lack of interest in the development of their communities. At the same time the feeling was expressed that the adoption of by-laws or similar procedures of a formal nature might tend to discourage some individuals from accepting membership on development groups.

Problem 3:

Concern was expressed about the multiplicity of agencies, organizations and groups of all kinds in existence at the present time with which people must deal and the possibility of additional organizations which might be encouraged to concern themselves with new programs which emerge from time to time.

This had specific reference to the anti-poverty program and the prospect of new community action organizations being established in connection with Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It was felt that existing RAD committees, if properly constituted, could well be the sponsoring groups for projects under this title of the Act. It was recognized, however, that special attention would need to be given in some instances to the addition of members who would be genuinely concerned with the problems of poverty and would look upon them from a sympathetic standpoint. It was mentioned also that consideration would need to be given to the addition of members from the poverty group itself.

In the same connection, it was suggested that representatives of State and local agencies most concerned with problems of poverty should be added to the membership of the State and local committees or Technical Action Panels, if not already represented.

Problem 4:

There is a need for getting on development committees or having available to the committees lay or professional people with the competence required to deal with the many and varied problems which arise.





Problem 4 (Con't.)

It was pointed out that the Technical Action Panels, even when broadened to include representatives of the many State and local agencies, cannot always provide the know-how or the amount of time needed to properly service the local committees.

It was suggested that committees first canvas carefully the local talents which might be available among lay people and attempt to obtain their participation in activities of the groups. It was further suggested that the membership on TAP's might be broadened. Finally, it was suggested that the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, if passed, might provide a source of funds with which to procure some of the specialized talents needed in areas of most acute need.

Problem 5:

There is a need for establishing a closer working relationship between development committees at both the State and local levels and the TAP's at the same levels.

The following suggestions were made as a means of developing this closer working relationship:

(1) Merge the RAD committees and TAP's. It was recognized, however, that this would involve the possibility of one group dominating the other.

(2) Have the committees and panels meet and operate together, with each retaining its identity and latitude for independent action.

(3) Assign a member of the TAP to meet and work with each RAD sub-committee.

(4) Have TAP's invite the RAD committee chairman and the chairman of each sub-committee to each of the panel meetings.

(5) Have the State RAD committee and TAP organize joint task forces to meet with the local committees and panels for the purpose of developing a better understanding between these groups at the State and local levels.

(6) Have State RAD committees and TAP's identify areas of most need within the State and concentrate its services on those areas rather than give uniform attention to all areas.





## REPORT OF GROUP II

### New England Regional RAD Conference

Subject: Relationships with State and Local Organizations

Chairman: George Witham

Secretary: Boyd L. Rasmussen

#### Problems

(1) Communications between agencies, groups, and local people have a tendency to break down.

#### Solution

(1) At all levels there must be a systematic continuing determined effort to keep the communication lines open between state and local groups and from local groups to state groups.

#### Problem

(2) Financing seems to always be a big stumbling block in the end. Some groups do not want any federal financing, but the majority of local problems must finally face up to the financing. Sometimes this is a dead end and frustrating.

#### Solution

(2) There must be knowledgeable people at the state and local level who have available information on the financing and aid available. More effort must be made to spell this out for local use.

#### Problem

(3) There has been somewhat of a limit on the help and cooperation immediately available from the state level. Especially when new programs start.

#### Solution

(3) Adjustments in state programs must be and have been made as the programs develop. Continuous efforts must be made to meet the current urgent needs. Understanding is needed on all sides.

#### Problem

(4) Motivation - Local organizations and groups do not always see the needs of their areas.

#### Solution

(4) Programs must be understood explained and sold. They must be generated at the local level and motivated from there if they are to have a chance of success, through:



- (a) Combined efforts of local business organizations and service clubs must be used.
- (b) Local people must be fairly represented
- (c) Greater understanding must be secured through womens groups and local women.
- (d) Agency people must serve as catalysts.
- (e) Better education of the youth is a long term goal.

Problem

(5) Towns and counties make too small a geographic unit in many cases.

Solution

(5) Greater use of logical areas in development of larger program cutting across town and county lines.





REPORT OF GROUP III

New England Regional RAD Conference

Subject: Problems and Solutions in Getting Effective TAP  
Contributions to (a) Program Formulation, and  
(b) Project Planning.

Chairman: Benjamin Isgur

Secretary: H. E. Hecker

Program Formulation

Definition: Program formulation is recognized as a process in which needs and opportunities of people are recognized, then goals, objectives, and priorities are established after which action programs are put into motion.

Problem:

1. TAP's must find a way and means of getting its information to local people through the media of lay and professional leadership.
2. Too often the TAP has not organized itself in such a manner to most effectively present the total information along with appropriate interpretation of the opportunities.
3. TAP's need to recognize both the physical (soil and water) and human resources and present its contribution accordingly.
4. TAP's cannot shirk their obligation to make certain that the RAD process is active in community development.
5. TAP's must find ways to work with RAD committees other than just at committee meetings.
6. TAP's must recognize that situations and problems dictate the organizational structure of RAD in line with the needs of the people to be serviced.
7. TAP's must be in position to present their best combined judgment as to alternatives for community development.
8. Training for TAP's in-program formulation and project planning must be given high priority so they can work effectively as a team.
9. TAP members must recognize that each must work on the RAD concept even though it may apparently be time consuming. However, the effort must make it possible for the individual to be more useful to his agency and to the Department's total effort in improving rural America.





10. Local RAD programs often are not sufficiently comprehensive to permit agencies to work to their maximum effectiveness. Therefore, TAP's must encourage complete unified program formulation.

11. TAP members must be involved early on all programs as well as project formulation if their best judgment is to be effective.

#### Project Formulation:

Definition: Projects are activities which are directed toward satisfying the program objectives that will result in identifiable progress that will meet the needs of local people.

#### Tasks of TAP's:

1. TAP's must keep themselves informed on what projects are in the making so they can properly advise with the local people.

2. TAP's should encourage the local people to consider all project opportunities.

3. TAP's must assume the position of leadership in providing or finding assistance needed by the local people.

4. TAP's should recognize that many project opportunities are new to the local people and the Panel must find ways to encourage RAD committees to move forward on these kinds of projects.

5. During project execution, members of TAP's must become active as a part of the local team in carrying out a project.

6. Project assistance often is a specific agency responsibility and it should move ahead aggressively. However, the agency has the obligation to keep other TAP members informed.

7. Each TAP member should evaluate his activities to effectively integrate his contribution to the total RAD movement.

8. TAP's must recognize the tremendous contribution of time and resources given by local leadership and give them credit.



-96-

REPORT OF GROUP IV

New England Regional RAD Conference

Subject: What are the Goals of RAD and are they Adequate for New England?

Chairman: Nelson LeRay, Jr.

Secretary: E. C. Weitzell

Initial discussion of RAD goals led this group to conclude that the ultimate and real goal was "better living for people, both farm and nonfarm." Considerable discussion of the rural focus of RAD led to a consensus that RAD in New England could not be limited to a rural concept but had to include many urban resources. As a result, it was felt that the word "rural" should not be utilized, or that if it is utilized it should be interpreted to include any and all resources outside of central metropolitan areas. Others felt that this matter should not be allowed to consume our time and attention because it is the needs of people wherever they may live that should be the focus of resource development activities.

A discussion of the 10 goals included in Assistant Secretary Baker's address led to a rather vigorous discussion of the family farm concept. This subject drew diverse comments from the members of the group and threatened to develop enough dissension to break up the meeting. At this point an attempt was made to bring the discussion back to an agreeable basis.

It was then agreed that goals 8, 9, and 10 as included in Mr. Baker's address were most applicable to New England. During this discussion, it was generally agreed that specific goals should derive from grass roots; otherwise they would not be acceptable to the people involved. Therefore, any statement of goals made by Federal or State agencies should be considered flexible and in need of adaptation to the values and concepts of people.

Silas Weeks of New Hampshire suggested that this conference might well be concerned with intermediate goals or the methodology of RAD, which he felt really was the subject of the conference. On this basis, he recommended that we consider the aims of RAD to be to: Enhance, Examine, Endorse, Educate, and Expedite.

The secretary then suggested that another characterization of RAD might be to provide leadership, education, development and coordination as a framework for attacking various problems and for implementing various opportunities.

The group ended their discussion with a resume of the general situation, which makes it imperative that the agencies of the Department and other Federal, State and local agencies coordinate their various activities in such a way as to bring about the maximum benefits from our educational and action programs.





REPORT OF GROUP V

New England Regional RAD Conference

Subject: Proper Development of OEDPs and Coordination in the Other Planning and Development Programs, Including Functions of Respective Agencies

Chairman: James Wood  
Secretary: R. D. Jones

1. A. OEDP is a misnomer and should be eliminated as a necessary element of the RAD effort.  
  
B. A basic resource inventory is necessary early in the organization of a county or area but this should be considered as an inventory and not as a plan.  
  
C. Immediate action should be taken when problem areas can be readily identified and documented rather than waiting until the basic inventory or other surveys have been completed.  
  
D. Continuous planning is imperative and written plans should be made available to all agencies and lay people who might be involved.
2. All resource inventories should include a directory of assistance available from all federal, state, regional and local agencies. (Sometimes it appears that each agency seeks the limelight and credit that it does all the planning).
3. The Extension Service should plan workshops for all public and private agencies and interested individuals for the purpose of instruction or resource analysis, inventory and planning. Workshops should be provided at the local, state and inter-state levels.





## REPORT OF GROUP VI

### New England Regional RAD Conference

Subject: Need for Feasibility Studies and Research in Project Implementation and Who Can Provide Them.

Chairman: Harry Keener

Secretary: Dr. R. H. Treadway

There is a definite need for feasibility studies early in the consideration of any proposal or project. An inventory of the area's assets and definition of its goal or objectives, however, should precede any feasibility study. The community or its local RAD committee should list the unique resources and advantages the region has to offer and then decide in what general way it would like to improve its situation. In evaluating a proposal, feasibility should be considered both from the physical and economic aspects; in other words, will it work and does it fit into our needs and objectives? If manufacture of a new product is under consideration, answers must be obtained to such questions as: Is the raw material supply adequate; is transportation good enough in the area; is the labor supply adequate and sufficiently skilled; will roadblocks be encountered in distribution and marketing of the finished product?

The RAD Committee in conjunction with the Technical Action Panel should take its proposal to a coordinator, such as the County Agricultural Agent or a paid official specializing in RAD work, who in turn will bring together necessary advice and know how from State Experiment Stations and Federal agencies for study and recommendation of various alternative actions. The community will then make its decision about how to proceed.

Many State and Federal Government agencies can contribute to the RAD program. These agencies should tabulate their capabilities and make them known to representatives of the States, such as the Experiment Station Director or Dean of Agriculture in the absence of a central RAD man in the state. There is a large reservoir of research data and information on hand from which RAD can draw in putting various desired projects into effect for improving the economic welfare and way of life in rural areas.

Volume 100, Part 1, 1970

Edited by

Prof. J. H. J. VAN DEN BERG

The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute is a quarterly publication of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. It is devoted to the publication of original research papers, reviews, and other material of interest to the study of human evolution, human biology, and human behaviour. The Journal is published by the Royal Anthropological Institute, 21, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1A 3EF.

The Journal is published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October. The subscription price of the Journal (which includes postage) is £12.00 per annum in advance. Single issues are available for purchase at £3.00 each. The Journal is also available in microfilm and microfiche editions.

The Journal is published by the Royal Anthropological Institute, 21, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1A 3EF. The Institute is a charitable organization, and the Journal is published at the expense of the Institute. The Journal is published by the Royal Anthropological Institute, 21, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1A 3EF.

REPORT OF GROUP VII

New England Regional RAD Conference

Subject: Effective Administrative Arrangements for doing the RAD  
Job and Needs for Additional Resources

Chairman: Leslie Kimball  
Secretary: R. F. Droege

To orient the discussion the chairman stated that this subject concerned itself with U.S.D.A., State and University organization rather than RAD committee or alternative types of organization which is being discussed by Group I.

Discussion

Technical Action Panels cannot just stand by and wait for a call if the hoped for results of RAD are to be realized. TAP members must work with Extension in getting RAD committees organized and moving. TAP must be careful not to be making decisions for RAD committees.

Recommendation No. 1.

The RAD committee and the TAP should be combined into one committee. Where it has not already been done, state agency people in such fields as forestry, recreation, fish and wildlife should be made members of the RAD committee. It is recognized that there may be times when agency people might refrain from voting in committee deliberations.

Discussion

After considerable discussion of the difficulties involved in moving RAD ahead this group agreed that one vital need is a person in each state with full working knowledge of all assistance programs and how they can be utilized in RAD programs.

Recommendation No. 2

Funds should be made available to each state in New England to employ a full time person on RAD. The position should be in Extension in order to realize the full educational benefits of RAD in addition to physical and natural resource developments.

Discussion

Reference was made to the effective work that has been and can be done by the Office of RAD coordinator for New England.





Recommendation No. 3

The time of the Regional Coordinator of the Office of RAD should be proportioned to all New England states.

Discussion

The presentations and discussions at this two day meeting have pointed up the need for better exchange of information between states and counties regarding RAD efforts, successes, failures, and the reasons therefor.

Recommendation No. 4

Procedures of vehicles need to be devised for better exchange of information in RAD work.

Discussion

The information presented at this meeting has shown that the President's anti-poverty program as set forth in the proposed Economic Opportunity Act now before Congress is oriented heavily toward development of the nation's human resources. Also it appears that existing agencies, organizations and programs encompassed in RAD can be effective in implementing the Economic Opportunities program, especially in rural areas.

Recommendation No. 5

States, through their RAD committees should start immediately to study and keep currently informed on the Economic Opportunities program to insure that the possibilities it offers for development of human resources are fully utilized in RAD.





INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMING FOR AREA DEVELOPMENT

My assignment today is to discuss the application of non-agricultural government programs to Rural Area Development. Let me start off by saying that this is an impossible objective. Merely to list the probably applicable programs and their distinguishing characteristics would take the greater part of the afternoon.

Instead, I will try to direct my remarks to the question of the application of programs rather than the detailed substance of programs.

Most Federal programs helpful to area development and related aspects of unemployment, poverty and economic growth are inter-governmental programs. As such, they cut across traditional jurisdictional boundaries and administrative compartments. Each such intersection multiplies the difficulties inherent in policy execution. Technical specialists in one subject are frequently at a loss as to how to effect a workable relationship with others in parallel activities. It is not uncommon to find that officials who share a common objective are not in contact with each other.

These relationships can become even more fragmented on the State level of government where many programs reach the point of execution. On the local level, the county and the municipality, where part-time officials predominate and advisory committees flourish, the confusion is often complete. To the essentially private citizens who serve on planning boards, industrial development commissions, overall economic development program committees, conservation boards and school committees, there is an apparently unending array of alphabetically denoted agencies and programs.

I am convinced that the coordinating and clarifying of relationships among programs must be achieved among the various Federal and state agencies before rather than at the local point of delivery.

Some significant approaches to this end are being worked out in Massachusetts. When the Area Redevelopment Act was signed into law, the Commonwealth established, by order of the Governor, an Interdepartmental Committee on Economic Development. This committee was intended to recommend ARA projects to the State certifying officer for approval as required by the Federal law. Twenty-one agencies and operating units of the State government

---

Speech by Joseph F. Courtney, Research Associate Professor of Government, The Graduate School, and Associate Program Coordinator, Area Development Center, Boston University, at New England Regional RAD Conference - Boston, April 29, 1964.





were represented on this committee at the deputy or assistant commissioner level.\* Many of these designees had never dealt with their counterparts in other agencies until they served on this committee. I believe all would testify to the benefit of the intercommunication made possible by this committee.

Because of the importance of its responsibility, the Committee has met regularly with the Governor. As new Federal programs were launched--the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Public Works Acceleration Act, for example--this group could draw upon its informal capacity for coordination and exchange of ideas to assist the Chief Executive of the Commonwealth in moving to take full advantage of the opportunities presented to the State and local government.

Governor Peabody has drawn upon the Committee to organize the regional development conferences which he is sponsoring jointly with Senator Edward M. Kennedy in the major labor market and redevelopment areas of Massachusetts. In company with cooperating Federal officials, the State agencies prepared brief, informative background papers on program areas and offered a direct, personal contact to local officials and economic interests. No miracles occurred, but the subsequent gain in perspective and appreciation of the viewpoint of regional leaders far from the State House has contributed measurably to reducing friction in solving persistent local problems involving Federal and State government.

The recently organized Area Development Center at Boston University is another step in the provision of resources to aid local officials and private businessmen in coping with development problems. Its central mission is to focus the faculty competence of Boston University on the broad spectrum of area development, and to devise an urban and economic extension service generally modelled on the Agricultural Extension Service. One phase of our present contract with the Area Redevelopment Administration calls for an experimental program of business counseling to smaller firms in depressed areas--an approach to area economic growth and stabilization which concentrates on a form of extension service to existing private enterprises.

From the viewpoint of the purposes of area development, whether we call it "rural area development," "urban renewal," "area redevelopment," "resource development," "anti-poverty," or "economic development," no clear distinction is apparent in most of New England between rural and urban areas. Much of the region is economically inter-dependent. The regional "infra-structure"--

---

\*Executive Office for Administration and Finance, Department of Commerce and Development and the Divisions of Commerce, Housing, Planning, Research and Urban Renewal, Department of Agriculture, Division of Banking, Department of Public Health, Department of Education, Department of Natural Resources, Division of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Industries and the Divisions of Research and Statistics and Apprentice Training, Department of Public Welfare, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Accounts of the Department of Corporations and Taxation, Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission, Water Resources Commission, and the University of Massachusetts.





the technical term for the essential public services, facilities and amenities which provide a framework for economic growth--the effect of geographical influence, population skills, and existing private investment are factors which partly transcend political boundaries in each state and between the states. However, within the states and sub-regions of New England there is opportunity for earning the rewards of deliberately cultivated comparative economic advantage. In every section there is untapped development potential.

How well this potential is realized depends principally upon the effectiveness of efforts to exploit it. Admittedly, more effort is required in some areas than in others. But, the greater the effort demanded, invariably, the greater the need for the effort.

The value of the various government programs lies in their usefulness in constructing and executing the development strategy of an area. Here I use the word "strategy" deliberately. It implies the designation of objectives and the direction of specific activities to accomplish the intended objectives. Thus, it is wrong to think of the multitude of government aid programs as a grab bag to which access is controlled by the semantics of title and the incidental luck of the applicant. Urban planning assistance is as helpful to the small town and the rural county as it is to the huge metropolitan region.

Whether an area or community extracts the full measure of development assistance proffered by government programs, is chiefly determined by the sophistication of its own development program and the competence of its leadership. These variables also limit the degree to which development goals are achieved. The correlation is not accidental. To state it bluntly, an area or a community should know where it is going and the route it will take to get there.

The first step, logically, is the formalation of goals and objectives. This demands a hardheaded identification of weaknesses and problems and an unromantic assessment of resources and the specific nature of growth potential. Minimum and maximum objectives ought to be determined to guide the allocation of development effort. Another name for this process is planning.

Fortunately, there are a number of Federal programs which provide both planning funds and technical advice ranging from the design of sewage disposal systems to regional transportation planning. In some instances, evidence of planning is a formal requisite for other kinds of financial assistance. The Urban Renewal Administration insists that a community prepare a "workable program" as a condition of eligibility for urban renewal project grants. The Area Redevelopment Act sets up the approval of an overall economic development program to establish eligibility for participation in its benefits as clear recognition of the futility of traveling blind in development matters.

A well-conceived development plan will suggest the priorities for attention and the many sources of assistance, Federal and otherwise, which may be tapped on behalf of the development program. Two excellent examples of well-directed economic planning can be cited in Massachusetts. One is





the \$60,000 technical assistance project, supported by a grant from the Area Redevelopment Administration to the Northern Berkshire Development Corporation, for the preparation of a comprehensive four-season recreation, tourist and vacation program for that area. The other is the program of the recently organized Essex County Economic Research Corporation. This group is sponsoring the design of an economic development strategy for the entire county with the aid of a \$50,000 technical assistance grant from ARA. It is significant that successful economic development organizations are already functioning in each county.

The capacity to exploit a competent blueprint for economic growth is equally necessary. Most often such capacity derives from one or more available professionals. These may be found in many roles--bankers, chamber of commerce secretaries, industrial commission staff, a town manager, the director of a development foundation--even a consultant. In any event they are action oriented, and are able to grasp the difference between effective development technique and useless drum-beating. The most pathetic performers are those who obtain the rezoning of a large parcel of vacant land, post signs that "Dimville Welcomes Industry" and wait for an inundation of prospects. This is not work for dilettantes, although a committee of compatible, tireless citizens may produce appreciable results with good advice and solid community support.

The importance of local government to the development program cannot be exaggerated. It is on this level of government that a majority of the tangible decisions to implement development policy are made, e.g., zoning, educational expenditures, tax assessment policy, waterworks construction, etc. Here we return to the concept of the "infra-structure." The willingness to invest prudently in the future is essential. For example, without financial support and adequate facilities, it is not possible to maximize the advantages presented by the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Vocational Education Act or the Federal urban renewal program. The location decision of a small business which must have ample water, must satisfy that requirement; only then can the local development foundation and the Small Business Administration apply their lending power on behalf of the community.

In summary, then, the basic ingredients in the recipe for the effective application of most Federal program assistance to area development are:

1. planning for realistic objectives;
2. competence in executing the development plan;
3. community leadership and local government alert to the needs of the future; and finally
4. coordination between Federal and state government and among their component agencies.



SUMMARY AND A LOOK-AHEAD

By  
Lloyd H. Davis  
Administrator, Federal Extension Service

My assignment, to summarize the conference and to look ahead, I will treat as one operation. The summary is in effect a look ahead, because our work here has not been limited in any sense to a critical examination of our past performance. All the time we've been talking, we've been looking ahead.

I'm going to pick out some of the ideas that came across to me, that came through our discussion, and try to fit these together in some sort of a meaningful summary of the significance of our work the last two days. I'm sure I won't hit all the significant things by any means.

Your selection of a theme itself is significant -- Making RAD Work in New England. Making RAD work was obviously our goal in this conference. This reflects your commitment to RAD. It reflects your determination that RAD will work, your recognition that it takes some doing to make RAD work -- some doing by us and by a lot of other people, that the process of economic development in our rural areas isn't an automatic one -- that it does take some work and some teamwork. We have had considerable emphasis on the teamwork here, and I think this is good.

And then you said, in "New England", in this theme. We have a great unity in the United States. We are one great nation, with many similarities among the regions, many things in common among the people in various parts of our great nation. Yet, New England is New England. In many ways New

---

Talk given at New England Regional RAD Conference, April 28-29, 1964,  
Boston, Massachusetts





England is different. We're all aware that in New England the county government is somewhat different than in other parts of the country. Town government is much more important in the governmental structure than it is in some other parts of the country. Here we have the stronghold of individualism. Yes, in many ways New England is different, and I think it important that you have this in your theme, Making RAD Work in New England.

Our program has also emphasized some of the differences within New England. For instance, it was emphasized early in the program, that New England is divided into three parts -- northern New England, southern New England and the northeast kingdom. It's a long way from Washington County, Maine to Fairfield County, Connecticut, not so far in terms of miles as in the nature of the economy, the employment of the people who are living there, the density of the population, the resource base and how it's used, and how the people want to use it in the future. We have great differences, between the very rural counties in which the people are dependent on the land, forest, water and wildlife resources to provide them with employment and income. At the other extreme, highly urbanized counties on the fringe of New York City where income comes from urban employment, and the land, water, forest and wildlife resources are in great shortage for residential, industrial, transportation, recreational purposes. In many of these communities people place great value on esthetic contributions that these resources make to their lives.

There's a great difference between New England areas with little in the way of developmental organization before RAD came along, and other





areas where there is highly developed organization that's been going for many years.

The program has emphasized that with this variability it's important that we have the kind of flexibility in rural areas development that Secretary Baker emphasized in his keynote talk. He indicated that we should use whatever terminology fits the environment in which we're working, we should use whatever organizational schemes are appropriate in each area to help us work together with the people toward these goals.

Our program has emphasized that in each of these parts of the area people have resource development and conservation problems, and they have goals with respect to the use of these resources, in which RAD can make an invaluable contribution. For instance, we were told about the need in Aroostook County, Maine for new farm enterprises which can provide for added farm income and employment and provide a greater stability in the agriculture. We were told about the great accomplishment made through RAD in getting the sugar beet industry established. In Washington County, Maine, there is an entirely different situation, entirely different goals of the people. We were told how they are dealing with the use of their lumber, their scenic resources, their recreational potential, the development of fisheries.

Incidentally, we've talked a lot about income-producing recreation enterprises in recent years. I feel a little like an old-timer in this respect. I started discussing this about fifteen years ago. It seems to me that in this part of the country, where we are within easy commuting distance in all rural areas of vast metropolitan populations, we have the



the greatest opportunity for this. I would personally like to have heard a little more about your successes in this field.

I was reminded again of another kind of situation -- Martha's Vineyard -- where my evaluation of the goal of many people there was that they would like to maintain the character of that Island as the unique bit of geography it is, so that it would continue to attract the high-income recreation trade they now have. And down in Norfolk County, Massachusetts, I think a priority goal might be to keep a little open space for the children of the future to have some fresh air and a place to play, and birds to observe. To me, the meeting emphasized that there are concerns, there are problems, in each and every area of this part of the country to which RAD can and is making important contributions.

I think, too, our program has illustrated the message that Dr. Sargent conveyed to me, the message that there are certain basic principles which apply throughout the area, regardless of these variabilities. For example, there is the principle that people can't develop their opportunities unless they recognize them and understand them. Then it seems to follow that in the whole planning processes, among the professionals, and among the lay people, there must be people with vision. There must be people with ideas. If there's nobody involved that has dissatisfaction with the present or ideas as to how things can be better in the future, if these people aren't there, not much is going to come out of the process. Another principle that seems to apply everywhere is that local action by local people is dependent on knowledge, understanding and their confidence that they can do something successfully.





Another one of the messages to me in these principles was that by working with groups, through some kind of an organization of lay people, call it what you will, we can get a broad understanding of the problems and opportunities throughout the community. Also by working through such a broad segment of the people we can get more than understanding. If we have involved the people who have the power to take particular action, then they're ready to take action when the opportunities have been analyzed. In the committee structure we use, we need to include people from many walks of life, not only to get an understanding flowing into the community, but so that we will have involved in this structure people who are in a position to take key kinds of action as the program develops.

Another principle that seems to apply everywhere is that to have action there must be understanding.

It seems evident from our discussion that wherever we're doing RAD work, we have a need for the technical action panel. The more complex the situation, the greater the need for this panel. Mr. Courtney's talk a few minutes ago emphasized to me the need for the development of a panel, and a close working relationship among members of that panel. I was a member of Mr. Courtney's panel at one time. I was one of those who was involved in one of the first meetings of that group. I knew from experience what he was talking about when he said that there were twenty units of state government, all having a contribution to make, many of whom didn't know the other fellow. When they gradually got acquainted with one another and knew the contribution each could make, they developed a





respect for the competency and the contribution of the other. Then there began to develop a higher degree of coordination and teamwork. We get this coordination and teamwork when we do understand and appreciate the competency the other has and the contribution he can make.

I think it is well illustrated by the examples presented this week, that the greatest progress will be made by local people when we, the agencies, are working together cooperatively to help them. We might say that one of the values of such a conference is to get us better acquainted with one another to foster this coordination back in the states and counties.

Another one of the principles Dr. Sargent mentioned was that we can all learn from the experiences of others. Lay people can learn from the successes of people in other communities. We, the professional workers, can learn how to do our job as we observe how it's being done in other areas. That is one of the values of this kind of a conference. We have a chance to find out what's going on in Washington County, in the north-east kingdom, and in other places. We can sort from this some lessons that will help us at home.

This program has emphasized something else; that is the inter-action between human and natural resources. First of all, we develop the natural resources to serve the human resources. There is no other reason for developing them. However, people must do the developing of the resources. They do this only as they themselves develop in their understanding, their knowledge, their skill, their confidence, and their initiative. Economic development occurs only as people develop. For



instance, many industries come into an area only when they know there is a labor supply available that has certain skills. As employment opportunities develop, people must develop to fill the jobs that become available. There's a vast resource of underdeveloped human resources throughout our country, and this is the greatest waste of resources we have. The greatest waste is the round pegs in the square holes, the kids that dropped out of school before they realized what it would cost them in later life, and woke up too late. The real cause of poverty at which the poverty program is aimed is the underdevelopment of human resources. The Economic Opportunity Act that was discussed earlier in our program will provide more tools so that we can provide a balanced development of these two inter-acting types of resources -- human and natural -- and it will contribute to our total RAD program.

It has been a pleasure for me to have had the opportunity to be with you, to be back again in New England and to have an opportunity to participate in this very challenging, very interesting conference. Let us go back determined to make RAD Work in New England.







